

THE CATHOLIC MIND

VOL. XLII

APRIL, 1944

NO. 976

Postwar Prospect For the Church

JOHN S. KENNEDY

*Reprinted from COLUMBIA**

THE preeminent practical problem of the moment is obvious. It is that of the coming peace. At the conclusion of the war an attempt to make a sound and viable peace will be incapable. It will overshadow and, in a sense, comprise all other problems. The solution of this major problem should not await the fighting's end. It cannot safely await the fighting's end, as events show ever more strikingly. But it has been gingerly put off. The critics who say that the United States and Britain seem to have no definite plan for such a peace as is necessary, are in large measure right. Only the Soviet Union appears to have worked out a detailed scheme, and its chief, if not its only, objective is the interest of the Soviet Union. Hence it is not acceptable as a basis for general accord and will not work out. It will merely complicate the problem and abort a genuine solution.

Tied up with the business of making a proper peace are many related problems. One of these, for example, is the rehabilitation of the populations of occupied territories. This, in turn, takes in repatriation, emergency feeding, housing, food-production and employment, to say nothing of political reconstruction. Involved here are economic and social factors which are not parochial, but worldwide, such as debt, credit, raw materials, industrial competition, trade, transport by sea and air, and the like. These have been discussed variously and at length. The manner of their solution is bound to affect the life and work of the Church to a great extent.

But there are problems not so concrete, hence not likely to draw such popular attention, problems which will get more notice from Catholics than from non-Catholics, although they will touch the latter as well as the former.

* New Haven 7, Conn.

In a special way they have to do with the future status, freedom, activity and influence of the Church. What is the prospect for the Church?

ECHO OF KLAN-HAUNTED 'TWENTIES

Taking a rather narrow viewpoint, let us first consider what may be the postwar prospect for the Church in this country. The authentic, substantial growth in the influence of the Church in the United States achieved by the end of the war will probably be slight. Conversions, in and out of the services, will be offset by a decline in faith and fervor resultant from the atmosphere which war induces on the home front. The great spiritual revival which, many tell us, is one of the few sure and happy concomitants of war, has not yet taken place. The visions of our future which the seers summon up for us are markedly unspiritual, and in some degree anti-spiritual. Moreover, there is an unintelligent, indiscriminating rancor at work in the mass of our people, as witness multiplied instances of anti-Semitism, and this will sooner or later strike the Church.

After 1918 the Church in this country had to meet and to breast a strong tide of direct opposition. This reached flood proportions in the presidential campaign year of 1928. It may be said that the anti-Catholicism of the Klan-haunted 'twenties was but another seizure of the nativist and anti-Catholic fever which made its appearance in epidemic form at regu-

lar intervals throughout the nineteenth century. Yet the after-effects of the last war contributed heavily to the peculiar virulence of this plague in the first postwar decade.

In any country, war produces nervous agitation which takes time to subside. It brings about dislocations, psychological as well as physical. With peace there comes a general sense of disappointment, whatever the issue of the war, as the propaganda pressure relaxes. This was true after 1918. Added to this, the economic crisis, rocketing to a climax in the 'twenties and exacerbated, although not caused, by the war, was, to the generality, more painful than understandable. It made masses of the people restive and vengeful in a manner vague but bitter. In such turmoil, bigotry flourishes. Spleen has to be vented, whether or not its chance victims be culpable.

Practically the same conditions will obtain after the present war. Nativism and anti-Catholicism have not been exorcised, even if the first has possibly lost some of its potency. Social and economic upset is bound to eventuate, perhaps in a worse form than ever before. The people will be, at the same time, stirred up and depressed. Some physical distress, more psychological distress will occur. The latter will stem from many causes: the persistence of so-called wartime *mores*, numerous impermanent war-marriages, the lasting effect on countless homes of the absence of fathers in

service and mothers in industry, the still to come end-product of juvenile delinquency.

In addition to these, there is still another matter, perhaps less tangible, but none the less important in its consequences. We must not underestimate the extent of the belief that the war (that is to say, physical combat) is going to solve all problems. This fond notion is widely held. Its absurdity is obvious. Domestic problems of magnitude and complexity lie ahead; international problems are going to engage us more intimately, more disturbingly than ever before in our history. It has been a tragic mistake to give the impression that the war is something creative, constructive, a cure-all. It is nothing of the sort. At best it is an astronomically costly effort to stay and disarm a hideous conspiracy against man, the image of God. To have that effort succeed is something; indeed, a great deal.

But involved in the conflict are other questions, purely economic and political, nationalistic, imperialistic, immemorially historic. None of these will the war settle definitively. Some it will settle forcibly, though not necessarily with infallible justice. Some it will settle not at all. Some it will make worse. In their anxiety to get the citizenry totally into the total war, certain officials and commentators have spoken of the war as if it were a panacea. That note is not now sounded nearly so often or so strongly as previously. But it was sounded *fortissimo*.

Those who spread this notion were believed. The event will prove them wrong. When it does, disillusionment and resentment will follow. The psychological distress will be acute.

Of peculiar intensity will be the struggle over foreign policy. The vast bulk of the American people have, by now, been won away from their anchorage in isolationism. They have learned an expensive lesson in the hard school of experience. They are convinced that international cooperation is indispensable, and they realize that it must be implemented by force.

But, despite the haranguing to which they are subjected by those who seem to believe that the becoming role for the United States is that of a tail on anyone else's kite, our people are keen and cool enough to understand that international cooperation does not mean the unquestioning acquiescence of their country in the selfish cut-and-dried plans of others. There must be discussion, a thorough review of all pertinent questions, change where change is needed, and practical regard for the requirements of justice. In other words, our people will insist that cooperation does not mean, as some would define it, abandoning our isolationism in order to support and defend in arms the decisions and actions, just or unjust, which other powers have arrived at unilaterally and refuse to review, much less to submit to general discussion.

It will be of little use for the United States to renounce its isolation-

ism, if other powers are to remain fixed in theirs. Or say, rather, that it will be of terrible consequence, for it will mean that this country is pledged to maintain an international *status quo* which is not of one piece but a patchwork of situations severally and differently dictated by a group of isolated powers agreed only on the point that they must rule the world. If something of this sort comes about, as now seems improbable, our people's revulsion into isolationism will be like a tidal wave, and the debate over it will be fiercer and more divisive than anything of the sort previously experienced.

PROBLEMS SURE TO BESET CHURCH

In conditions so unsettling, domestic rifts are bound to be acute. The air will be full of flying crockery and dead cats. In the confusion, the Church cannot avoid incidental injury, as well as direct attack and leakage. Well-reasoned, apt, courageous and vigorous action can forfend or repair much of this damage, and even account for gains outweighing the inevitable losses. But the right kind of action will be necessary. It will not suffice to take an attitude of flaccid resignation nor yet one of plaintive or furious umbrage. The first is an abandonment of the true militancy of the Church, the second an exchange of her true catholicity and intelligence for an aggrieved and touchy sectarian spirit, that is, a spirit of mere protestantism, in the loose sense of the word.

As for the Church throughout the world, in the postwar era there will be a galaxy of vexing problems to harass and test her. As the direct result of the peace settlement, there will probably be difficulties arising from the resetting of boundaries where this means that Catholic populations are shunted into states heatedly or icily inimical to Catholicism. There will be other difficulties, perhaps easier to handle, regarding the missions. Of such matters nothing definite can be said now by the observer outside official councils. But any alert observer can see more general problems sure to beset the Church the world over.

One source of trouble will be the mere fact of the Church's being old. The new era will be one of change, constant and hectic change. An attempt will be made to clear away the wreckage of decades of social and military combat. Considerable change will come about simply as an evolutionary phenomenon, a thing familiar in history. There are, however, certain elements desirous of total change. They seek to make a *tabula rasa* of human society and the world scene, in order the more freely and fully to rebuild according to their own ideological specifications. What has been, is objectionable to them by reason of the fact that it is not of their making and not amenable to their totalitarian objective. It must be demolished.

The Church will suffer somewhat from the partial, more or less natural change, and much more from the pro-

jected totalitarian change. In the first case, it is not inevitable that the Church should suffer at all. She has existed for almost two millennia, and, in the course of these thousands of years, has seen and survived a long series of social and political modulations. She is divine and in that sense unalterable; but she is also human and, as such, marvelously adaptable to circumstance. Yet when change is swift and extensive, there is always unreflecting suspicion of ideas and institutions which antedate the immediate past. The criticism made of them is not that they are antiquated, but merely that they are old. It is assumed that age has disqualified them as pertinent to the present. It is taken for granted that they are irrelevant, no longer competent, if not actually harmful. So the tendency is to pass them by, to count them out. This will be true of the attitude of many towards the Church after the war. It is an attitude of passive resistance, one not of strenuous enmity, but of contemptuous dismissal. Catholics will have to prove the falsity of this assumption.

On the other hand, there will be an abundance of determined opposition from the swelling ranks of those who would instantly effect a complete change running all through society. The almost fanatical subscribers to this view are adamantly against the Church on many scores.

Basically their own philosophy is one of sheer materialism, garnished with sprigs of a spirituality more

verbal than real. This spirituality is accidental, secondary and impotent. It is eclectic; that is, arbitrarily selected, denatured and thrown in with principles and practices with which it is entirely incompatible. A dead snippet of spirituality is thought to redeem a conglomeration of theoretical and practical errors.

WORDS TWISTED TO PIECES

The cult of verbalism, here instanced, has made astonishing strides and wrought appalling havoc in recent decades, but the end is not yet. Men take terms, such as spirituality, emasculate and empty them, then fill them, for the moment, with whatever meaning expediency indicates. Thus, we have seen "democracy" used to mean a hundred clashing things and nothing at all. We have seen "freedom" twisted to pieces. We have seen "Christianity" stretched to cover denial of the natural law and some of the plainest and most solemn of Christ's doctrines. The Dean of Canterbury can apply the word "Christian" to full-fledged atheism. The Soviets can speak of "self-determination of peoples" when they mean the result of a small, foreign-controlled minority's trickery and terrorism. If the word is of good repute, the reality need not be considered. Whether the reality deserves the designation it is given (e.g., whether boisterous recreation deserves to be called education, whether counting the undotted "i's" in an Elizabethan manuscript deserves

to be called literary research, whether the blotting out of an independent state by armed aggression deserves to be called liberation), does not matter. What does matter is that an acceptable label be affixed. It is as if it became salutary to swallow a quart of prussic acid, provided only the bottle be marked "Milk."

Thus it is with the spirituality of the all-out materialists who would refashion society from its foundations. It amounts to a set of catchwords, a series of figures of speech, paper money without backing. Spirituality in the real sense of the word is to them a discredited myth. Now the Church holds not only the actuality of the spiritual, but also the primacy of the spiritual. Therefore the opposition she meets, and will meet more and more, at the hands of the ascendant materialists.

Another related point whereon the Church and the materialistic proponents of totalitarian change differ irreconcilably, is the nature and the sphere of religion. For the intrepid builders of a quite new world, religion properly so called has no objective validity whatsoever. It is no more than a relic of an ignorant and credulous past. It may have a certain beauty, of an imaginative or associational sort. But the only reality to which it corresponds is a blind urge in the subconscious. It came into being not because of its demonstrable truth, but because of the irrational subjective satisfaction which it afforded primitive man and

continues to afford man insofar as he remains primitive. As he is set free of the bonds of the primitive, he has less and less need of religion, until the process of his education comes to its term and he needs it not at all.

Religion, these refashioners of the earth maintain, has, and will continue to have, a social value. By this they mean that there should be a certain amount of religious coloration in the social mass. It is no essential part of that mass, any more than the artificial coloring is intrinsic to a carbonated drink. But it serves to beguile the ignorant and to aid in keeping order. The last point is stressed in textbooks now in use in American high schools. These books characterize religion as an auxiliary to the State. Useful as such, it has no independent existence or authority.

And here we come to yet another difficulty athwart the path of the Church. The power of the State has grown rapidly. A number of conditions contributed to this development. But what interests us here is the development itself: the endless extension of the orbit of secular government.

Opposition to Nazi and Fascist absolutism has been widespread. But not all of it, or most of it, is opposition to any and every absolutism. Rather, it is opposition to absolutism under brown shirt or black shirt auspices. It is not the performance which is opposed so much as the sponsorship. Perhaps the extremes to which

Hitler has gone are disapproved, but the idea that the state should be omniscient, with its unlimited power in the hands of an ideological élite, is not disapproved. Just put the business under nominally new management and all will be well.

The Church's struggle against Caesarism, then, will not come to an end with the smashing of Nazism. The succeeding proprietors of the firm are likely to give the Church plenty of trouble, to invade her sphere, to try to subordinate her and to confine her to the sanctuary.

"USING" THE CHURCH'S TENETS

This restrictive action will take many forms. It will be brought to bear on the social doctrine of the Church, a doctrine which has nothing opportunistic or one-sided about it, but springs from the concept of man and of society found in Christian theology. In her social teaching, the Church enunciates what is true, what is just, what laws established and sanctioned by God demand. It is not partisan doctrine. It is political not in the factional sense of the word, but only insofar as it indicates that, in the political sphere, appropriate action must be taken to put right principles to work. Such action the Church does not presume to direct or manipulate.

There is always a reluctance to take the Church's social teaching whole and literally. In the debate between capital and labor, each side tends to cite a part of the Church's teaching,

out of context, in support of its demands, scanting other tenets which it considers disadvantageous to itself, and trying to make of the Church its own sponsor rather than a non-partisan enunciator of principle. This is far more true of capital than of labor. In the labor camp there are many more leaders who understand the Church's social teaching aright, and agree to it unreservedly, than in the camp of the capitalists.

The "practical" men who will make up the ideological elite of an absolutist or near-absolutist state in future, will curtail the Church's freedom to proclaim her social teaching. If she is not altogether silenced, at least strong efforts will be made to prevent her from setting forth the features of her social doctrine displeasing to those in control of the State. Scores of means of embarrassing the Church, of punishing her for any alleged recalcitrance in this matter, stand ready to hand and will not be neglected.

Again, the absolutist State tries to arrogate to itself all social services. The sole source of initiative which it will recognize, is itself. It must be everything to the people. Any service which does not bear its stamp and is not in its grasp, will be maneuvered out of existence. This applies to charitable organizations of every sort, to hospitals, clinics, nursing services, orphanages, homes for the aged, youth groups, etc. The Church has always conducted such enterprises. In fact,

history shows that many of them are original with her. They are typically Christian in inspiration. They are palpable instances of that love one for another which Christ demands of His followers. The absolutist secular State wants to retain the physical benefits of these services, but it will not allow them to be identified with any body save itself. It rules out Church sponsorship of them. By direct and indirect pressure, relentlessly applied, it strives to drive the Church out of these fields.

That its reason is not the "inefficiency" which it attributes to the Church's operation of such activities, becomes clear when we consider its equally strong determination to stop education under Church direction. Here the Church is going to be faced with multiplied obstacles in the decades ahead. Despite the proved excellence of Catholic education, it is opposed simply because it is Catholic. That is, it is not a channel for secular or laic propaganda. It does not turn out prefabricated subjects for the beehive mentality and polity. It does not teach its students that the source of life, of law, of rights is the collectivity. Quite the reverse, it tells them that every man has eternal value in the sight of God because of his possession of a soul, and is answerable to God for his conduct; that his conscience may not be abdicated from within or overridden from without; that he may not surrender himself blindly to the herd and allow himself to be aimlessly carried wherever the

herd goes under the whips of its masters.

CATHOLIC EDUCATION TOO EFFICIENT

The absolutist State opposes Catholic education not because it is inefficient, but rather because it is all too efficient in the training of men and women not dumbly submissive to a totalitarian regime. That is why Hitler waged war on the Catholic schools in Germany. That is why the totalitarian "liberals" are hostile to Catholic schools anywhere. That is why the most determined efforts will be made by the absolutist State to strip the Church of her educational agencies.

There are two complaints commonly made by critics of the Papal pronouncements on the state of society. One is that the Popes take a gloomy view of the contemporary scene. The other is that they are not sufficiently worried over current developments. The first objection is based on the Popes' detailed analysis of the errors which they see advocated and acted upon by so many, errors which lead to misery and to a perversion of man and society. So far from truth and balance has the world lapsed, that men do not perceive how parlous is their position even when events and their own suffering shout it aloud. The Popes, wise and seasoned physicians, make a thorough diagnosis before prescribing, and they state their findings unequivocally.

The second objection is based on the Popes' refusal to designate any

partisan, political, economic, or social scheme as the sole alternate to the destruction of civilization or even of the world, of mankind. That is, the Popes have more real confidence in man than do the humanists. God's aid, God's grace are recognized by the Church as absolutely necessary; and she does not hold that man may, properly and profitably, do anything he likes, regardless of the law governing his nature. But, speaking through the Popes, she does fully appreciate the marvelous powers and resources with which man is endowed. Hence she never despairs. That is why the present Holy Father can

call our time not only one of dreadful catastrophe, but also one of unexampled opportunity. It is in this spirit that the Church faces the lowering skies of the future. She is marked for attack. But she will go on witnessing to the truth both in action and in passion. She will summon up all her strength, which means both the Divine assistance and the loyalty, intelligence and energy of her every member; she will summon up all her charity, which means her concern not only for her own children, but for all men. She will be wounded; in places she may be routed. But she will endure.



Peace Is Order

The peace of the body consists in the duly proportioned arrangement of its parts. The peace of the irrational soul is the harmonious repose of its appetites and that of the rational soul the harmony of knowledge and action. The peace of body and soul is the well ordered and harmonious life and health of the living creature. Peace between man and God is the well ordered obedience of faith to the eternal law. Peace between man and man is well ordered concord. Domestic peace is the well ordered concord between those of the family who rule and those who obey. Civil peace is a similar concord among the citizens. The peace of the celestial city is the perfectly ordered and harmonious enjoyment of God and of one another in God. The peace of all things is the tranquillity of order.—*St. Augustine, DE CIVITATE DEI, Bk. XIX, ch. 11.*

Labor Baiting

*Reprinted from the SIGN**

MANY attacks are being made on organized labor and not all of them are fair and just. On at least two occasions in the recent past, Westbrook Pegler, the widely read columnist, has assailed Catholic priests who have branded his attitude toward unionism as being one-sided. We agree with the priests and disagree with Pegler. No doubt Pegler is honest and sincere, but his judgment is warped. He sees only one side of the question. His campaign may result in putting some unsavory labor leaders behind bars, but at the same time he succeeds in discrediting the labor movement in the eyes of too many of his readers. From particular cases and abuses he encourages the drawing of universal conclusions. It is like condemning democratic government because some civil officials are corrupt or repudiating the Catholic Church because some Catholics are bad.

After all there must be some good points about labor unions. The great triumph of production since Pearl Harbor is a tangible proof of this. Of course this does not justify concluding that everything is perfect. Strikes, threats of strikes and other labor trouble during wartime are to be condemned, but is it fair to put the whole blame for this situation on labor? Government policies and the tactics of many employers need to be

considered also if a balanced judgment is to be formed.

We do not single out Pegler because he is the only offender in this matter but because he is the most typical case of labor-baiting.

A realization of the struggle labor has gone through to arrive at its present position of power will help to form a more realistic and rational opinion of the merits and demerits of the American labor movement. For over one hundred years, labor has had to carry on a stiff fight to gain any kind of recognition. As Catholics, we know that it is the explicit teaching of our Church that men have a right to organize themselves into unions, to protect their interests. This right has not always been recognized in America, and State and Federal governments were not unwilling to join with anti-union forces in an endeavor to suppress the movement. Under such circumstances, is it any wonder that lawless leadership occasionally came to the top? Quite the contrary. The wonder is that the labor movement has remained as conservative and law-abiding as it has. In this we have been fortunate in comparison with many other countries.

During this period of struggle, unions took the attitude that they were private and voluntary organizations with many enemies to contend with.

* Union City, N. J., February, 1944.

They were constantly on the defensive. They considered their main function as fighting for rights that powerful groups were ready to take from them. In such an atmosphere it is not remarkable that emphasis was placed on rights and not so much attention given to duties. They felt their duties were plain enough. What they needed to gain and to protect were better working conditions and a greater share in the wealth their work helped produce.

RIGHTS AND DUTIES

In 1935 a change came in labor's status. With the passage and enforcement of the National Labor Relations Act, unions can no longer be considered private organizations whose affairs are solely their own. With the Federal government recognizing union organization and collective bargaining as an essential part of our industrial relations, unions were placed in a responsible position in the social and economic life of the nation. With employers being bound to recognize unions as legitimate bargaining agencies, the agreements entered into between unions and employers can no longer be considered as private affairs concerning only the parties involved. Now such agreements have so important a bearing on public welfare that they must be considered as affecting the interests of the people at large. This puts a new and heavy responsibility on labor and its leaders.

Abuse, relics of the past stage of private warfare, which still flourish in certain sections of organized labor, must be brought under control. It must be fully accepted that dishonesty, discrimination and racketeering are evils against the public good whether they are committed by members of labor unions, employers, or other individuals. On the other hand, the existence of these defects does not call for a movement to suppress unions or to place all blame for industrial unrest on them. It is true that many labor leaders have shown an undue sensitiveness when blemishes have been pointed out. This is a wrong attitude and should be discarded for a frank facing of the facts.

It would seem also that in many cases the new-found power that unions enjoy has created a new overemphasis on union rights without due consideration of responsibilities. There is no reason to believe, however, that time, experience and wholehearted adherence to our American traditions will not bring about a balance between rights and duties in the interests of the common good.

Our whole point can be summed up by saying that carping criticism alone will lead to bitterness and confusion, while a constructive and intelligent approach will aid in reforming abuses and backing those who can promote the prestige of unionism and extend its influence for the general welfare of America.

On The Uniting of Churches

*Reprinted from The CATHOLIC MIRROR**

IN this country, the Episcopalians and the Presbyterians have been talking of uniting. After six years of struggling with the problem, a committee lately submitted a plan of approach to unity. In a very forthright sermon, Bishop Manning, Episcopalian Bishop of New York, would have none of the plan. To him, the proposed merger would be effected at the cost of the Episcopalian Church destroying itself. Very logically, the bishop thinks that, if an Episcopalian keeps the faith, he cannot be a Presbyterian; it is only when an Episcopalian denies his own faith that he can identify himself with Presbyterians, Mohammedans, Buddhists, or what have you.

It would surely be most disconcerting to Bishop Manning, if Orthodox bishops and priests were to give him a dose of his own logic. Episcopalians do pay assiduous court to the Orthodox, and do not find the Orthodox too cold to those advances. It is common to read in our papers that Episcopalians have secured for their religious celebrations and ceremonies the attendance of Orthodox clerics in full canonicals.

Only recently, after "Uncle Joe" Stalin had piously and benignantly allowed the Russian Orthodox to elect a new Patriarch and form a Holy Synod, the first foreign cleric to visit

the new Patriarch was not an Orthodox Bishop from the United States, as might have been appropriately expected, and as might have been engineered diplomatically, since we are so determined to appease Russia. The visitor was not even an Orthodox Patriarch from Constantinople, or Alexandria, or Antioch, as would have seemed most natural. The visitor was the Anglican Archbishop of York, England.

Such fraternizing of the Orthodox and the Anglican forces Catholics into a difficult but unavoidable position. It is grievously painful to know of real bishops and priests engaging in non-Catholic rites. On the other hand, no Catholic bishop or priest could invite an Orthodox bishop or priest to an active part in a Catholic service, because that would be equivalent to the falsehood that they are wholly Catholic. The treasures of the household of the Faith can be set before only those who loyally and truly belong to the one family of the Faith.

It is not clear how much meaning the Orthodox give to their participation in religious services with Anglicans and Episcopalians. They may regard those relations as only harmless external courtesies. Perhaps the Orthodox give no deeply religious meaning to those relations, but find them expedient.

* 1387 Main St., Springfield, Mass., November, 1943.

Indeed, no truly religious meaning can be given to those inter-relations. If the Orthodox were as sternly logical as Bishop Manning was with regard to the Presbyterians, the Orthodox would have to declare most definitely that there is no *religious unity* of the Orthodox Churches and the Anglican or Protestant Episcopal Churches.

That declaration the Orthodox must make, if they are true to their own definition of "Orthodox," the "true believers." "Orthodox" is a noble, a holy word.

In the Canon of the Mass, immediately after the Preface, in the Roman Missal, there is the prayer for the whole Church. In that prayer, there is really defined twice what the Church is. The second definition is emphatic, precise as to the Mystical Body, naming the Head, the Pope, together with the Bishop of the diocese, and the body of members, *omnibus orthodoxis*—"all true believers."

A TRAGIC STORY

The Orthodox have given that great name to themselves. In courtesy, we call them by that name. In truth, and justice, we cannot give them full, clear right to the title. Why? It is a long, long story, an unhappy, tragic story.

For the beginning, we must go all the way back to the fourth century, to the Emperor Constantine. Does it seem strange to begin a story of schism with the man who freed the

Church and is venerated as a saint, not only by the Orthodox, but by many oriental Catholics? We see what Constantine did not foresee.

Constantine made Constantinople. He laid the foundations and more of that city's grandeur and power by making it the capital of the Roman Empire. It was not difficulties over doctrine, but pride and ambition, which were the evil agencies of schism, of schism so grievous that it finally tore into pieces the unity of Christ's Holy Church.

The Council of Chalcedon, the fourth ecumenical council, was held in 451. Of the 630 bishops present, 626 were from the East. These bishops clearly and firmly declared for the true Catholic Faith as to the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome, the Pope, the successor of St. Peter, whom Jesus Christ Himself had appointed the Head of His Church.

Unfortunately, this Council did more. It did something for Constantinople. It made the See of Constantinople a Patriarchate. That was not all. The Council introduced among the bishops of the Church something which Christ had not put among the Apostles. Among the Apostles, Christ gave St. Peter a *unique* place, as their head. Christ distinguished none of the Apostles as second to St. Peter.

The Council of Chalcedon did. It asserted a position for the Patriarch of Constantinople as second to the Pope. The Pope never ratified this canon of the Council. The Pope was

right and wise and prophetic. In that canon he saw the ugly fact of usurpation, and the vicious threat of evils bred by human ambitions and jealousies—the threat of future schism.

John IV, who was Patriarch of Constantinople from 582 to 595, took to himself the resounding title, *Ecumenical Patriarch*. This windy claim was another storm signal. The defense measure then taken by Pope St. Gregory the Great was to call himself *Servant of the Servants of God*. This title the Popes have used ever since, in signing some official documents.

The storm of schism, which had long been brewing, broke under Photius, in the ninth century. The life of Photius was indeed a tempest. Pushed into the place of St. Ignatius, the true Patriarch of Constantinople, he was excommunicated by the Pope. Photius then excommunicated the Pope, and the whole Western Church. Later, Photius was deposed by an ecumenical council, the Fourth Council of Constantinople.

When St. Ignatius died, Photius was elected his successor. This election was confirmed by the Pope. Photius showed his gratitude by reopening the schism, which lasted until he was again banished.

There are Catholics scholars who argue whether Photius was really the *Father of Schism* or the *Patron of Reunion*. Whatever was the real guilt of Photius, the schism is now surely a fact, an unhappy, terrible fact.

The rupture between the East

and the West was made complete by Michael Cerularius, Patriarch of Constantinople, 1043–1058.

While it can be truly said that Michael Cerularius finally and fatally tipped the balance, there was still a see-saw between schism and reunion. The Council of Lyons effected reunion in 1274, which lasted eight years. As late as the fifteenth century, at the Council of Florence, 1439, the Orthodox solemnly returned to the One True Fold. In 1472, Constantinople again departed into schism.

Officially, the Catholic Church regards the Orthodox as schismatics. The Mother Church can only grieve over the prodigals who followed the evil course of the Patriarchs of Constantinople, Antioch, Alexandria and Jerusalem. The Orthodox are now divided into many independent national churches like those of the Orthodox Churches of Russia, Greece, Roumania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia. Among them there is missing that *true unity* which is the glorious mark of the Roman Catholic Church.

Is there, then, any hope of the reunion of West and East, of Catholics and Orthodox? Before we can deal at all with the question, we must accept the one certain and absolute fact: there can be no union of members of a body except with their head. *There can be no true reunion of Churches except with Rome.*

Is that the arrogance of Rome? Is that the narrow and sterile isolationism of Rome? The answer is that

the Pope cannot bargain over the rights of Christ—His rights to obedience from all His followers, made one body by union with the Head, appointed by Christ, Peter, the Pope.

That one principle of unity being absolutely determined by Almighty God Himself, are there any hopes of reunion between Catholics and Orthodox? Happily for religion and for world peace, there are:

First: what has happened, surely can happen again. In the past, more than once, the Orthodox have bridged the gap of schism.

Second: the Orthodox have not lost the Apostolic Succession. They do have valid orders. Their bishops and priests are really bishops and priests. Surely there is an immeasurable power

for good, a power which Anglicanism and its progeny, Episcopalianism, unfortunately have lost.

Third: in each nation having an Orthodox National Church, there is also a militant minority group of nationals who are loyal Catholics in union with the Pope. That fact is undeniable, and a promising bond.

There are other reasons for hope, of course, among them the good will, the love the Popes have shown to the prodigal Orthodox. The Pope does not despair of reunion. Despair would be rebellion against Christ's will that all His followers be one. Despair would be a doubting of Christ's own omnipotent charity toward the prodigal sons of God.



Charity Vital to Peace

It is not enough for peace and concord to be preserved among men by the precepts of justice, unless there be a further consolidation of mutual love. Justice provides for men to the extent that one shall not get in the way of another, but not to the extent of helping another in his need. One may happen to need another's aid in which none is bound to him by any debt of justice, or where the person so bound does not render any aid. Thus there came to be a need of an additional precept of mutual love among men so that one should aid another even beyond the obligations of justice. Hence it is said: "This commandment we have received, that whoever loveth God should also love his brother." (1 John 4, 21). "This is My commandment that you love one another." (John 15, 12).—*St. Thomas Aquinas, SUMMA CONTRA GENTILES, Bk. 3, ch. 130.*

Democracy and Christian Democracy in Italy

LUIGI STURZO

Reprinted from *The Epistle**

ITALY is coming to democracy through no merits of the Conference at Moscow, where democracy is not yet born, nor through the merits of A. M. G., which, being a military administration in an occupied land, cannot have a political mandate. The Italian people, on the very day of the downfall of Fascism (July 25, 1943), claimed the return to the democratic freedoms which Fascism had suppressed.

The reader must bear in mind that in Italy before Fascism there were democratic institutions in all the branches of public life. The disturbances that, for four years, Italy suffered, between the end of the first World War and the March on Rome (November 1918 - October, 1922), were partly due to the unsettlement of the post-war period, and partly due to the struggles awakened by the Fascists with their methods of violence and by exciting the minds of youth to a nationalistic fanaticism pernicious in internal as well as in foreign affairs. Fascism strove for the destruction of the democratic regime because the latter gave the working classes the opportunity of participating in the public power through municipal and provincial councils as well as in the Parliament itself.

At that time the working class was organized in two large parties. The Socialist Party had 121 deputies in the Chambers and was supported by the "General Confederation of Workers" with almost 1,500,000 members. The other was the Popular Party with 107 deputies. It was upheld by the "Italian Confederation of Workers." These numbered 1,200,000.

The program of the Popular Party and of the "White" Confederation (it was called "White" in opposition to the Socialist Confederation which was called "Red") was the program of Christian Democracy, which had for its basis Leo XIII's Encyclical *Rerum Novarum* (1891) which, between the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the present century, enjoyed great popularity and an enthusiastic following among students and working youths. So it was believed then that Christian Democracy was bound to overcome the Socialists' forces.

But the dissensions between the two wings of Catholics (the Conservative and the Democratic) were very sharp. The youth movement was mistrusted. Mistakes there were. The Vatican intervened; Pius X suppressed the "Organization of Catholic Congresses" (*l'Opera dei Congressi Cat-*

* 112 E. 57th St., New York 22, N. Y., Winter, 1943.

tolici) which for thirty years had withstood rationalistic Liberalism and Marxist Socialism. Then the Pope reorganized the Catholic ranks in the Popular Union (1906). Benedict XV approved the nomination of a Directive Council of Catholic Action (1915). The crisis of Christian Democracy was passed through very slowly. Only during the first World War were the Christian Labor Unions reorganized, and their Confederation established. Finally, in January, 1919, the Popular Party was founded.¹ Thus Christian Democracy was reborn not only in the social but also in the political field with autonomous organizations of its own detached from Catholic Action which remained under the direction of Church authorities.

FASCIST JUSTIFICATION

Fascist propaganda to justify the *coup de main* of the March on Rome (October 28, 1922) thoroughly falsified the history through which Italy was to arrive at the totalitarian tyranny. Up to yesterday it was almost impossible to be listened to if one tried to show that pre-Fascist Italy was on the road to material and moral improvements and everything pointed to a general prosperity. Even today, after Fascism has fallen, everybody is repeating that Italy then passed through a period of "anarchy." It is tremendously hard to make people un-

derstand that Italy was a sound country in spite of the unhappy effects of the war.

The Communistic danger, of which so much ado has been made, was magnified only as a result of Fascist propaganda. The Italian Communists in 1921 (when they parted from the Socialists) had but seventeen deputies in the Chamber. Half of these called themselves Communists either on account of their relationship with Moscow, or to differentiate themselves from the Socialists. But their words carried little conviction concerning the Communist paradise because they themselves were not quite convinced. As a matter of fact it was what Sicilians call "four cats on a roof"; they made noise, but they were only four.

Most of the Socialists, on the other hand, were *reformist* like the Socialists of Australia or of Sweden. If in Italy they often talked of revolution, it was because they did not bring it about, and they did not believe in it either, except the extremist wing which, now and then, imitated the methods of the Fascists. It was, in fact, the Fascists who brought about the revolution in earnest by clubs, guns and bombs, or with castor-oil administered to victims in public amid the jeers of scoundrels. The Socialists had their Lewis and their CIO's and went on strike (especially the railway men). These strikes, however, were never as

¹ It was in November, 1919, that the Sacred Penitentiary repealed the "non expeditur" whereby, for half a century, the Italian Catholics had been forbidden to partake directly in political life.

grave as those in America. But the whole world was informed that trains never ran on time before Fascism but only when Fascism came into power. The whole world applauded Fascism for restoring order in the Italian "anarchy."

Those, however, who really scared the wealthy bourgeoisie and the big landlords were the "Popolari" who claimed for the workers a participation in the factory profits by means of special "shares," demanding that the large estates (*latifundia*) should be given to co-operatives in order to be cultivated (abolishing in this way the exploiting intermediary), or to peasants for an annual lease in order to form a family property. Finally, for the zones intensively cultivated, they asked for the reform of the agrarian pacts. All this was brought before the Parliament in the form of bills. There were also occupations of estates on the part of peasants, guided by Christian Democrats (or by Socialists), and even by priests from the parishes. It was an irresistible popular movement which, nevertheless, was soon checked by the Government.

The big bourgeoisie saw in all this a very serious danger, namely, that Socialists and "Popolari" might some day understand each other in order to win the majority in the Chamber of Deputies (in which both numbered 228 out of 508), and control the policy of the country. As a matter of fact Socialists and "Popolari"

fought each other, in and out of Parliament, over the freedom of the schools, private property and the legalization of the Labor Unions. The big bourgeoisie, who for half a century had been ruling the nation, had, in such a crisis, to settle accounts with the working class and its unions. To combat Socialists and "Popolari" and sweep them out there was no other way than to resort to Fascism. Then the Fascists, who had only thirty-five representatives in the Chambers, were able to gain the upperhand and to form a revolutionary government. The big bourgeoisie were sorry for that, but it was too late. They, too, paid dearly for their treason against democracy.

A country ruined and destroyed, such as Italy is today (after twenty-one years of tyranny and a terrible war which is being waged throughout its territory), cannot rise to a new life except by the virtue of its people. By people we do not mean the working masses alone, but all the classes and all the organisms of the Nation in free co-operation. If there were but one class (say the capitalist or the working class) or only one caste (say the military), or one party (the Socialists, the Liberals or the Christian Democrats), there would be neither liberty nor co-operation by all, but one group superimposing itself upon the whole country. There would be no resurrection, but only a varied attenuated repetition of Fascist dictatorship. Italy cannot revive under the aegis of a dictatorship, even a benevolent one.

Nor can she tolerate the prevalence of a class (usually the wealthy), which being such cannot be other than selfish and exploiting. The first "Risorgimento" was mainly effected by intellectuals and the bourgeoisie, by young élites and some of the most advanced sections of the working class. For the revival came from above while the masses were still bound to the paternalistic regimes of the epoch. But since Italy had a representative and parliamentary regime and, for about a decade, even a democracy (although woman suffrage was still wanting), it is not possible that the second "Risorgimento" should now be the work of one political category or one social class. All must concur in it with the consciousness of remaking, of its foundations, a new country, not only materially but also spiritually.

Democracy is order. Whoever thinks of a mob democracy confuses democracy with demagoguery. There will certainly be difficult moments in the reconstruction of a devastated country. It is the duty of the moral and political chiefs of the people to make all those who concur in the revival of such a country realize the tremendous responsibility that rests upon them. The passions of the people carry within them a surge of elementary justice and of national love which ought not to be checked but rather canalized and used constructively to overcome the destructive instinct ever smouldering in every man. People grow restive when they lack the legal means of ex-

pression—elections, Parliaments, Senates, juries, councils or local assemblies. When these bodies practice justice and equity in public life, people respect them. On the contrary, when vexed by unjust authority, people rebel, and if they cannot, they plot.

POLITICAL PARTIES

As soon as Fascism fell, five parties which had long been in existence in Italy sprang up at once. They thrust their heads out of the graves wherein Fascism had buried them. They were: the Social Party, the Christian Democratic Party, the Action Party, the Justice and Liberty Party, and the Communist Party.

"Why so many parties?" the reader may ask. In America—a very large country—two are enough. The difference between America and continental Europe is soon clarified. In Europe the political parties are not organized in a businesslike manner. They have no capital at their disposal, and their congealing, until the birth of the Workers' parties, could be said to have been accidental and personal—feelings, traditions and interests were mixed up. The labor parties were formed on the framework of the leagues and professional unions or with their support. From revolutionary groups they became groups within the law. Today, as well as yesterday, there are three parties of this type—the Socialists, the Christian Democrats and the Communists. The other two are a mixture of radicalism and liber-

alism which is rooted in the middle and higher classes.

But we must not think that the labor parties are made up exclusively of workers. There are in their midst elements of the little and middle bourgeoisie, and intellectuals, too. In the Popular Party of pre-Fascism one of its most dynamic forces was the intellectual youth. But its social program and the support of Christian Unions characterized it as one of the *parties of the masses*.

Each of these parties has its history and its names. The Socialist Party had Karl Marx as its remote ancestor. But the names dear to Italian workers were those of Prampolini, Costa, Barbato, and later, Turati, Treves, Matteotti. The Communists appealed to Lenin, although they could better claim their origin from Marx. They could not boast of important Italian names before Fascism. But they can claim them now that Fascism has made political victims of such as Gramsci, who died in jail, and others who were shot to death.

The "Populari" had great names. In the social field two above all—Leo XIII and Professor Giuseppe Toniolo, an apostle of Christian Democracy whose informative process for beatification is already under way. In the political field the neo-Guelphs of the "Risorgimento" were the so-called "liberal" Catholics—in the sense that they wanted liberty and the Constitution. Among them the most famous were Father Ventura, General of the

Regular Clerics, Alessandro Manzoni and Antonio Rosmini. To this list should be added now Father Manzoni (a victim of the Fascists), Filippo Meda and Angelo Mauri, both former Secretaries of State who passed away recently, leaving behind a luminous record of virtues and activities. In other countries the glorious names of Liberty and Christian Democracy are Frederic Ozanam and Père Lacordaire in France, Windthorst in Germany, O'Connell in Ireland—to mention only a few who are well known also in America.

Catholics all over the world are interested in Italy for two reasons: because the Italian people, as a majority, are Catholic, and because the Pope is in Italy. They are, therefore, justifiably concerned as to the eventuality of an anti-clerical government or of one in any way hostile to or in conflict with the Church. Those, furthermore, who, either in good faith, or on account of a skillful propaganda, thought that the Fascist government was Catholic or favored the interests of the Church, have been greatly disappointed at learning that Fascism was such a scallywag affair—that priests and Brothers would have been better had they stayed away from it. Now that anti-Fascism surges higher in Italy, what would be the remedy for the conflicts with the Vatican, whom people accuse of having favored Fascism?

One must realize that a type of mentality and tradition, which this

writ
has
wil
that
ther
hol
riou
is t
Italy
alist
four
occu
are
poli
afra
him
day
tem
the
Tre
that
Tod
say
arch
disa
prot
reac
Fasc
type
alian
has
cles
pres
ject
able
tanc
men
of
Such

writer has often called "Ghibelline," has never been lacking in Italy, nor will be lacking in the future. Granted that there is the Papacy over there, there must be those who love and uphold it, as well as those who, for various reasons, combat and hate it. This is the word of Jesus Christ. But in Italy, apart from certain zones, rationalistic and Voltairean, which can be found likewise in America, the pre-occupations concerning the Papacy, are not on the religious but on the political plane. They are always afraid that the Pope wants to concern himself with Italian politics. Yesterday they said it was to defend the temporal power. After the solution of the Roman Question, with the Lateran Treaty of February, 1929, they said that the Pope was favoring Fascism. Today when Fascism has fallen, they say that the Pope upholds the monarchy. In the event that the monarchy disappears, they will say that the Pope protects the conservative classes or the reactionary groups and the crypto-Fascists and so on.

He who does not understand this type of mentality, characteristically Italian (since Italy from Constantine on has been the seat of a world-wide ecclesiastical power which cannot be preserved like a relic or a dead object, but is a center of life) is not able to grasp the paramount importance of a Christian Democratic movement independent, as a political party, of the Vatican and of the Bishops. Such a party ought to assume the re-

sponsibility of the social and political struggle in the country, disengaging the Bishops and the Vatican from the political implications which it is customary to attribute to them. This the "Partito Popolare" did between 1919 and 1922, and achieved a great deal of good. This, too, will the new Christian Democratic Party, now in the process of forming, do.

STRONG STATE NEEDED

When the "Popular Party" came into the picture, they said that it was a "longa manus" or an instrument of the Vatican. People, however, understood at once that the "Partito Popolare" was autonomous in its political activities and parliamentary initiatives. The attack then collapsed. Soon the party became a bone of contention. Socialists and Liberals attacked it, but they met with notable resistance. The issue on the freedom of education was the most serious one, and they fought over it for three years in the Parliament and in the country as well. The second was the agrarian issue; the third that of the Labor Unions; the fourth that of municipal and provincial freedoms against State centralization. These were passionate and generous struggles in which the "Popolari" showed a courage that deeply impressed and convinced political circles.

Unfortunately, the Fascist revolution undermined the situation through the use of violence. Tomorrow violence, from whatever source it may come, must be checked by the author-

ity of the State. That is why the Christian Democrats want a strong State. This strength must not come from the military nor from the capitalists either, but from the People in an effort at cohesion never before exerted. Christian Democracy, a center party between the two extremes, an inter-classist and not a one-class party, a party based upon Christian morality and not upon positivism and amoral pragmatism, will be able to contribute more than ever before to such a union of the Italian People.

ANSWER TO ANTI-CLERICALISM

When the people become convinced that the Vatican has no particular interest in favoring one party more than another, the rich rather than the proletarians, nor is it concerned in depending on a monarchy whose future is at stake, nor in recalling to life a Fascist government which has betrayed the interests of the country and the Church herself, then the Italian anti-clericalism and Ghibellinism will vanish for the lack of the wind of calumny and suspicion. They will be silenced also by the vigorous action of Christian Democrats—truly democratic and deeply Christian. There will be, of course, the problem of the Concordat which is branded by Liberals and Socialists as a Fascist instrument, and an impediment to the freedom of the country.

Apart from the dark hues in which the Concordat is depicted, as a scarecrow against liberty, we admit that there are in it some arrangements made exclusively for a totalitarian State like the Fascist, which are not adaptable to a democratic regime. But on the whole, the Concordat is not against liberty and it could be permitted to survive, with some modifications skillfully worked out in agreement with the Holy See. In the event, nevertheless, that public opinion should be artificially aroused so as to make the people believe that the Concordat is against their happiness (and in certain moments of depression like those that resulted in Italy from such a terrific defeat, the people's psychology may be excited even at the sight of phantoms!), then it will be expedient that either the solution of this affair be postponed for a more opportune time, or a friendly separation be devised so as not to infringe on the rights of the Church, and, on the other hand, so as not to stir up an anti-clerical reaction. After all, Belgium and the United States are countries without Concordats, and the Catholics in both places are satisfied. But whatever may happen in this regard, the future of Italy depends on her people. Let us remember that, in spite of all, Italians are a Catholic people and a democratic people.



Religion and the Radio

MICHAEL LINDEN

*Reprinted from ON SCREEN AND AIRLANE**

PROBABLY the most significant document of Catholic interest in respect to the rights and privileges of American citizens as these pertain to freedom of the air is that known as "A Brief for the Freedom of Radio Education" prepared by Professor Charles N. Lischka, and originally printed in the *Catholic Educational Review* of June, 1932.

Professor Lischka, a member of the National Committee on Education by Radio, was for many years identified with the Department of Education of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, has been an instructor at Georgetown University and at Loyola University in Los Angeles and for a considerable period was attached to the Code Production Administration of the Hays' office.

No Catholic interested in radio as a means of advancing the interests of the Church can afford to remain ignorant of the principles enunciated in Professor Lischka's scholarly document, written at a time when a serious attempt was being made to set aside fifteen per cent of the facilities within the broadcast band for education.

"The fundamental doctrine of liberty," it asserts, "upon which all institutions in this Republic repose, predicates the freedom of the air for

broadcasting purposes, and precludes the legal tolerance of a commercial monopoly of radio communication.

"Liberty, moreover, postulates the prevalence of the principle of fair competition among freely operating enterprises—with special privileges for none, with equal opportunity for all, with reasonable restraints and regulations established and enforced by proper governmental authority.

"Freedom of education is one of the most sacred of American liberties. Education is so vital a public interest that its freedom in all fields, including the air, must be maintained—maintained, if need be, at the cost of private sacrifice."

With respect to radio law, it is pointed out that radio is designed "to serve the public interest, convenience or necessity," that "radio stations enjoy no property right in specific frequencies" and that "more over the Federal courts have held that there is no property right in the continued use of broadcasting equipment and that the curtailment or termination of such use without compensation is not confiscation of property."

With respect to science, it is made clear that "the room available in the air for broadcasting is limited," that there were then approximately six

*Catholic Film and Radio Guild, 739 N. Mariposa Avenue, Hollywood 27, Calif.

hundred stations operating in the United States, that many engineers considered this number too large and that if the number of educational stations were to be increased, time on frequencies, or both, would have to be taken away from the existing commercial stations.

With respect to policy, it is recorded that "the spokesman of commercial concerns have expressed unalterable opposition to independent educational stations." Quoting Henry Adams Bellows, vice-president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, on the proposal that fifteen per cent of the facilities within the broadcast band be reserved for education, he is represented as saying: "If this plan means that fifteen per cent of the wave lengths are to be allocated to educational institutions for the use of radio stations which they will own and operate, all the experience of the past ten years in every country in the world rises up in opposition."

FREEDOM OF THE AIR

While the controversy waged, a feverish effort was made by all commercial radio systems and stations to broadcast more and more educational material. The National Committee on Education by Radio, in which Professor Lischka represented the National Catholic Educational Association and the Rev. Thurber M. Smith, S. J., represented the Jesuit Educational Association, pressed the case for legislation by Congress that would "prevent

the definite formation of a virtual monopolistic radio trust, anticipate inevitable future development, and properly provide for the public interest by reserving a fair proportion of radio facilities for education."

The educators failed to sway the Congress. Stewardship in respect to the place that education and religion might have in enjoying freedom of the air was placed solidly in the hands of commercial interests.

Because freedom of the air has actually been denied education—and its ally, religion—there is no good reason why Catholics should not assert that right consistently and yet seek to avail themselves of such advantages as fair-minded systems or stations accord them without charge.

One of the most important papers on this subject of how to advance the Faith by use of the airplanes is that written by Edward J. Heffron for *The Acolyte* under the title "The Radio Apostolate."

Mr. Heffron is Executive Secretary of the National Council of Catholic Men, which broadcasts the Catholic Hour. Few Catholics have had such an experience in the radio field.

Not for a moment losing sight of the principle enunciated by Professor Lischka that religion is entitled to freedom of the air and that it has unjustly been denied that freedom, Mr. Heffron's sound advice on how Catholics, making the best of a bad situation, can utilize the radio for the

spread of the Faith, should be carefully studied by all intelligent Catholics.

"Because radio is a business impressed with a public interest," he writes in part, . . . it is under statutory obligation to serve the public, or, in the language of lawyers, to serve the 'public interest, convenience and necessity.' If religious people are sufficiently alert and energetic, they will see to it that the fact is brought home to the broadcasters that the public interest, convenience and necessity comprehends religion. Hence there should not be and there is not the same difficulty in getting radio time for presentation of the Church's message, as there is in getting newspaper or magazine space for the same purpose. . . .

"But we Catholics are not using radio as much as we should. Every commercial station in every community where there is an appreciable number of Catholics should carry one or more Catholic programs on their sustaining schedule; that is, free of charge. If they don't, I am afraid that, in nine cases out of ten, you can lay it to the fact that Catholics have not sought radio time or have not sought it with sufficient persistence coupled with a knowledge of their rights and a readiness to offer a good instructive and entertaining program.

"Certainly religious programs—like educational, cultural and entertainment programs—are in the public interest. And any station that does not

have at least one Catholic program on its schedule—at least if it is an area where there is an appreciable number of Catholics—is depriving the Catholic public of its rights. Hence it should be possible to persuade all or nearly all radio station owners to schedule a regular Catholic program free of charge. Not only is there no good reason why the time should be paid for—there is every good reason why it should not.

"However, two things should be said in this connection: First, one cannot expect the broadcaster to accept a Catholic program, or any other program, unless it is genuinely good; and secondly, since his duty to take religious programs is implicit in the law, not explicit, and since even if he takes a Catholic program it lies in his discretion to assign to it a good or bad time of day, one should not make demands upon him, but should put the matter up to him in a fair, courteous, friendly manner. . . ."

Mr. Heffron discusses, in the light of the experience gained through the Catholic Hour, the various types of programs and the different approaches to the public of which they admit. Inasmuch as the Catholic Hour, in a single year, has received as high as 225,000 pieces of audience mail and is known to have disposed thousands favorably towards Catholicity besides making many conversions, Mr. Heffron's suggestions might be studied with profit by all Catholics interested in radio.

The Postwar Racial Question

JOHN LAFARGE, S.J.

Reprinted from The CATHOLIC COURIER JUBILEE MAGAZINE*

WITH remarkable unanimity, everyone familiar with the racial scene in the United States fears for the situation after the War.

This apprehension was stated in a forthright manner by a group of Catholic leaders in industry and labor in a statement on the employment of Negroes in the defense industries, which was released at a meeting in the Catholic Club in New York City on May 15, 1942. To quote from this statement:

A long-distance program will be concerned with the future, with the grave problems which will inevitably arise when our country's war effort shall have been brought to its conclusion. The immediate crisis demands our paramount attention; but we cannot afford to lose sight of the very serious possibility of a wide-spread and hostile reaction against Negroes in the industrial field once the pressure, however ineffective, shall have been removed that the war creates for their employment.

Such a reaction is bound to occur if administrative or legislative measures now promulgated on behalf of Negro employment during the war period have not been accompanied by a corresponding growth of conviction in the public mind that *lasting principles, not a mere passing emergency*, are here at stake.

We can think of no simpler way to insure this far-reaching program than to insist upon a forthright and complete application of the great Social Encyclicals and the social program of the Bishops of the United States to the economic and vocational problems of the Negro. The social

teaching of the Church as to the inviolable dignity of the human person is not qualified by conditions of race, creed or color. Its great outlines have been clearly stated by the Roman Pontiffs and by our Bishops as applying to all men without exception.

What, then, are we doing now to prevent such developments in the postwar era? What are we doing and what can we do as Catholics? Let me say, frankly, that we do not realize, as we should, the tremendous power the Church can exert if, and the "if" is paramount, we act in time.

Our weakness in these matters is not lack of power but lack of willingness to understand our power. The force of Catholic opinion in the field of race relations in this country is like a mighty giant who allows himself to be tied down by a million tiny silken threads believing that they are solid cables but able in reality to snap them if he but makes a serious effort.

There have been many instances in the past where action by the Church was taken and the results were immediately felt. There are other instances where this action was not taken but if it had been exerted we can safely conclude that the present picture would be very different.

Here certainly is a matter which we cannot allow to go by default. The Catholic Church in the United States has the power to speak, because it

* 50 Chestnut St., Rochester, N. Y., November 25, 1943.

possesses the truth, a sound social teaching on the natural equality of man and the supernatural unity of all men in Christ. We have a splendid charter for such utterances in the great social Encyclicals, and we have a blueprint in the statements of many members of the American Hierarchy. The question then arises, what action in the concrete shall we take to forestall the disorders in the postwar world?

CATHOLIC INTERRACIAL COUNCIL

In order not to burden the reader with details, I am suggesting a single and central plan which, if carried out, will serve to coordinate many types of action. This plan is to form now Catholic interracial councils in our cities or dioceses. By a Catholic interracial council I mean a small group, eight or ten are sufficient, of high-caliber Catholic laymen in a city or community, men chosen not for their social or political prominence or other types of window dressing, but for thoroughly apostolic devotion.

This group will meet constantly under competent direction and with due authorization from the local church authority. They will inform themselves by careful study. The study will be directed to principles of sound race relations as taught by the Catholic Church as well as to the factual matter, historical, sociological, etc., that determine their application particularly in the local community.

In establishing such a group confusion can be avoided by certain considerations. It will be a Catholic group in order that it may consider every phase of the question from the full light of Catholic teaching and be linked with the entire program of Catholic Action and Catholic Social Action.

This, however, does not exclude by any means cooperation with non-Catholic agencies or membership in committees of a general character directed to this end. The rules for Catholic participation in such committees or organizations which look to interracial harmony are the same as those which will apply to our participation in other forms of work with non-Catholics.

This interracial council may be set up as an independent organization, a special agency created for the purpose, or it may be simply a committee of Holy Name Society men, Knights of Columbus, or some other organization in good standing. The main point is that it should *exist* and that it should be *active*.

A clear distinction should be made between a long-term and an immediate program. The immediate program consists in the prudent mobilizing of resources to meet immediate emergencies as they may occur, acquaintance with existing organizations interested in this problem, knowledge of key personalities and so forth.

If actual danger is foreseen of race riots, this committee will consider

how well-prepared are local civic authorities and take immediate measures. They will be particularly concerned with regard to the *mobilizing of leadership* that can be exerted by the different racial groups themselves.

Looking to the more fundamental question of a long-term program, such a committee will endeavor to go to the root of both present and future race disorders.

Unless this is done thoroughly, any form of interracial work will simply play into the hands of extremists of either side, demagogues within the racial group and prejudiced Ku-Klux type of minds.

This matter is clearly and authoritatively stated by a leading Negro authority on social action Lester B. Granger, in his article "The Harlem Riot—Before and After" in the *Interracial Review* for August, 1943. Says Mr. Granger:

Let us take, for instance, the matter of jobs. Full employment for the Negro is more than a question of mass picket lines, economic radicalism or CIO vs. A. F. of L. controversies. It is even more than a question of full stomachs for hungry Negro families. It is also a question of more secure property values in the Negro neighborhood, larger and better-distributed buying power in the whole community, cheaper police, fire and hospital services—in short, a safer, more beautiful and sounder community structure . . .

The chief importance of church movements for interracial understanding, whether the Catholic Interracial Council or less formally organized groups, lies in their potential influence upon church congregations and their ability to harness the "bread-and-

butter" interests of church-goers to real life problems affecting the interests of Negroes. It is not enough to preach brotherly love as a substitute for racial prejudice.

It is of capital importance for the real effectiveness of such a committee that its interracial work, namely, in the combating of prejudice and building of a sound public opinion, shall be combined with a thoroughly *intra-racial* plan to build up the morale and sense of responsibility of the race itself.

Finally, to complete the picture, by suggesting that the work of the committee is, from the nature of the case, a cooperative undertaking. It is not something just handed out by the majority to the minority; it is not paternalistic or "Negrophile." The motivation of such a council is that of our common interests.

High principle and ordinary common sense and the experience of all such undertakings demand that members of both races work together. But certain conditions have to be met.

The white man must realize that a great many of the most intelligent Negroes have developed an extreme race sensitiveness owing to their considerable contact with innumerable pinpricks which must be experienced in order to be understood.

On the other hand, the Negro who takes part in such cooperative work must realize that his own good is frustrated by a chip-on-the-shoulder attitude and a demand for perfection where the real fight is for fundamentals.

One observation comes vividly to the mind in proposing such a plan: the regret that this type of work, which is so eminently Catholic, has been left so largely to those with whose basic principles we cannot agree.

Far too many Catholics are deterred from a sound program of human rights and social reform on Christian principles because liberalistic or Communist elements get there first.

The race problem here at home is, after all, but a symptom or manifestation of the whole international world conflict. It is a symptom of the world's disorder.

We have the opportunity, the remedy in our own communities, our own cities, towns, parishes, countryside for those evils that are shaking the world. Liberalistic and Leftist elements are familiar with this world

aspect of the local race problem; let us also familiarize ourselves with the same. They have the opportunity, which they eagerly embrace, though they have thrown aside their responsibility to God and man. We have the responsibility, which is laid upon us by Christ Himself, the responsibility of the Catholic layman, clothed with his share in the priesthood of Jesus Christ, and we have an opportunity which is unparalleled, which is granted to no other sort of people in this world. Yes, we American Catholics, we men and women in our Northern and Southern cities.

Let us stir up, as St. Paul says, the grace that is in us and let us begin now before the night falls to prepare lest the powers of darkness sweep the world into still greater catastrophe than that in which it is now involved.



Death of St. Thomas Aquinas

At the reception of the Eucharist on his death-bed St. Thomas Aquinas made this statement: "I receive Thee, redeeming Price of my soul. Out of love for Thee have I studied, watched through many nights, and exerted myself; Thee did I preach and teach. I have never said aught against Thee. Nor do I persist stubbornly in my views. If I have ever expressed myself erroneously on this Sacrament, I submit to the judgment of the holy Roman Church, in the obedience of which I now part from this world."—THOMAS AQUINAS, HIS PERSONALITY AND THOUGHT, by Dr. Martin Grabmann, Longmans, Green and Co.

Church Authority and the Bible

LESLIE E. DUNKIN

*Reprinted from The PRESERVATION OF THE FAITH**

"WHAT does the Church say about it?" asks the Catholic individual, when a puzzling question arises concerning religion, religious practices or ideals for daily living.

"What does the Bible say about it?" asks the Protestant individual, when facing a similar question.

The difference expressed by these two questions is one of the basic differences between the Roman Catholic Church and any, or all, of the many Protestant church groups. At the Church point of this difference we find the Roman Catholic Church and at the extreme Bible point of this difference we find the Baptist groups.

The Disciples church group, a division from the Baptists, declares emphatically: "Where the Bible speaks, we speak; and where the Bible is silent, we are silent!" At the same time the Catholic Church declares with even greater emphasis: "Where Christ or Christ's authority speaks, we speak; and where Christ or Christ's authority is silent, we are silent!"

Before analyzing these two claims, it will be well to consider some of the main results from this basic difference.

One main result is the presence of a false thought by many Protestant people concerning the Catholic

Church. Since the Catholic Church refuses to exalt the Bible alone as the sole Christian authority for people, many Protestant people believe and insist that the Catholic Church rejects and is opposed to the use of the Bible.

The unbiased facts are that each local Catholic Church makes a greater use of the Bible in the Sunday and daily Mass than does the average Protestant church group in their Sunday church services. Also the Catholic Church has followed the Bible in beliefs and practices more closely than any of the Protestant church groups.

Another main result from this basic difference is that the transition of recognized spiritual authority by the Protestant groups from the Church to the Bible alone, with each person as his own interpreter, is a serious step in a more serious trend. The Bible is merely a record. It can not be exalted alone as spiritual authority. A living interpreter is necessary.

The wit has declared: "Figures never lie, but liars will figure!" In much the same way, we might say: "The Bible never lies, but liars or incompetent or biased minds insist on reading the Bible with colored glasses."

Instead of exalting merely the

* Holy Trinity Heights, Silver Spring, Md., November, 1943.

Bible, the Protestants have been exalting the human individual. At first, they refer to it as the individual's right to his own interpretation. In reality, it has become the exaltation of the human individual at the expense of Christ and the Church—and in some instances of the Bible itself. The altar and the sacrifice as presented in the Bible have been replaced by the pulpit and the popular choir. This trend has continued until many a Protestant pulpit has become largely a popular lecture platform for the delivery of pleasing discussions of current events and book reviews—with both the Bible and God conspicuous by their absence.

SPIRITUAL AUTHORITY

Consideration of the results from the basic difference might be continued almost indefinitely without exhausting them. A much more important point is to analyze the source or claims of spiritual authority to determine which is more complete of the two—consequently all-important—, since this difference marks the line of separation between Catholics and Protestants.

Were the Protestants to recognize the Church as the highest Christian spiritual authority, all the differences would disappear and the protesting groups would be instantly absorbed by the Catholic Church. On the other hand were the Catholic Church to change to the Bible as the highest Christian spiritual authority with the

individual free to have his own interpretation, over-night the Catholics would become as divided and confused as the many Protestant groups now are.

For several centuries after the departure of Christ from His public ministry in Palestine, the Church was the recognized authority in spiritual and religious matters. The Bible record attests to this fact. In fact, the Bible did not exist then, as it is today. The New Testament group had not been selected—in fact, some of it had not been written yet.

As time passed and the personal memories of Christ's life and teachings became more distant, written records were made of His life and words. Prominent among these were those written by Saint Matthew, Saint Mark, Saint Luke and Saint John. Many other records were written. The Roman Catholic Church—the only Christian church organization then—decided it would be well to summon a council to decide what would be the recognized records to constitute the Holy Bible. It was not until around the seventh century that the Bible as it is today was finally decided upon by the Church.

When protesting groups rebelled against the authority of the Church, they accepted in turn the direct product of this same Church, the Church-authorized Bible. If the Protestants completely repudiate the religious and spiritual authority of the Church, how can they then consistently accept for

their new authority that which was the direct result of the definite action by this same Church?

As the Bible owes its official existence to the Church, so the Church in turn goes back to Christ Himself. Hence, it is well for all to consider the direct relationship between Christ and the Holy Bible or what the relationship is. The Protestant tendency is to place such emphasis upon the spiritual importance of the Bible that these people overlook what Christ Himself might have said or failed to say about the Bible.

In the first place, Christ Himself did not write anything—except that one recorded time when He wrote very briefly in the ever-changing sand. The Bible itself contains no other record of His having written anything. He relied solely upon verbal preaching and teaching, although writing was a known art at that time. If the written word, as found in the Bible, were to have such a supreme place in the lives of individual Christians as insisted by Protestants, would it not have been more logical for Christ to have written an autobiography of Himself, combined with a written detailed record of His teachings? But Christ did not do that. He continued with His spoken preaching and teaching.

In the second place, by a recorded conversational statement, Christ never commanded any Apostle or follower of Him to write an authority, such as the Bible, to have the highest spiritual authority over the Christians

and over the Church Herself. It is true that writers of the Holy Word were inspired by God to write their records and the Church council was led by God to assemble and select the Written Record, but nowhere was the direct command given by Christ while He was on earth in Palestine that any such writings were to be made a supreme Divine authority over individuals and even a superior authority to the Church.

In the third place, Christ never promised His followers that a Bible with supreme Divine authority would be provided for them. The Bible was provided several centuries later through the spoken authority of the Roman Catholic Church. Christ never left any command to the Christian people for their worshipful relationship toward the Bible. He wanted them to be Christ-worshippers, rather than Bible-worshippers. Christ knew and told His followers that He would leave them. Had He intended for the Bible to be given such a prominent place of religious authority even above the Church, is it not reasonable for Him to have made some direct statement about it and provision for it Himself? However, again He did not do that.

Christ was not so silent about the Church. He was continually preparing the way for the Church. He picked the Twelve. From these Christ singled out Peter. To Peter Christ made the announcement and promise concerning the Church.

The Bible itself contains at least three definite statements by Christ concerning the origin and authority of the Church.

In Matthew 16, 17-19, Christ had this to say to Peter: "Blessed art thou, Simon-Bar-Jona: because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father who is in heaven. And I say to thee; that thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven."

In Matthew 18, 15-18, Christ was talking to His Disciples, the future Churchmen in intensive instruction and training: "But if thy brother shall offend against thee, go, and rebuke him between thee and him alone. If he shall hear thee, thou shalt gain thy brother. And if he will not hear thee, take with thee one or two more: that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may stand. And if he will not hear them: tell the church. And if he will not hear the church, let him be to thee as the heathen and publican." Then comes the repetition of the former promise: "Amen I say to you, whatsoever you shall bind upon earth, shall be bound also in heaven: and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth, shall be loosed also in heaven."

Then a short time before His ascension, Christ was with the same group of Churchmen and said: "Whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven them; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained (John 20, 23)."

CHURCH AND BIBLE

Thus at Christ's command and promise, the Church was planned, started and given this great spiritual authority. God called Moses up onto the top of the mountain to prepare the written tablets of stone containing the Ten Commandments; but Christ called His immediate followers—not to present them with a copy of The Holy Bible, but rather to launch the Church on the great work of spiritual authority and responsibility for Him. Later the Church felt the need for producing and authorizing the Holy Bible to aid in the work by the Church for Christ.

The Bible—even the Protestant version—itself shows and states that the Church is all-important in Divine authority and responsibility for Christ's work. The Bible contains not a word about its own origin and authority as "The Bible." We must look to the Church to find this origin and authority of the Bible.

A chain reaches out from Christ to human individuals. Christ Himself placed the Church as the first link in this chain contact. Then the Church with Christ's leadership prepared and placed the Bible as one of a number

of links to be used by the Church in reaching people for Christ.

Thus, finally, the Church is all-important as it is the closest link to Christ Himself. To try to accept the Bible and yet to reject the authority of the Church, leads to doubly disastrous results—1) the direct contact with Christ is removed by this denial; and 2) the very authority of the holy

Bible itself is lost when the authority of the Originator of the Bible is removed.

For this reason, the Roman Catholic Church insists that the Church continue to have the all-important spiritual authority given to it by Christ and that the Bible continue in the place Christ intended for it through the action and use of the Church Herself.



Teaching From the Pulpit

The work of teaching to reach all the people and the ones most needy must be done in the sermon, and at the service of obligation. Sodalities, Catholic Action groups, and study clubs very incompletely meet the need. In general, those reached by these means will already be among the best Catholics, although many, even of these, are for quite just reasons not members of these organizations. Even those who ought to be, but are not, members, have the need and the right of instruction. Missions are an utterly inadequate substitute for constant, regular preaching. Steady teaching and exhortation from the pulpit is the only dependable instrument for building up an instructed, staunchly Catholic, God-fearing, and God-loving laity. No wonder that the law of the Church and the letters of Popes are explicit on this point.—THE EPISTLE, *New York, Winter 1943.*



Force and Reason

It is by force of reason and not by force of arms that justice makes progress, and empires which are not founded on justice are not blessed by God.—Pius XII, *Broadcast of August 24, 1939.*

THE EDITORIAL MIND

Liturgy in Los Angeles

IT has sometimes been averred by unfeeling souls that little good in the arts—and particularly the arts devoted to the Church—can come out of Southern California. We state this prejudice merely for the pleasure of refuting it as a baseless libel on a section of this country which can lay claim to beauties other than its renowned climate.

For instance, one of the finest little churches we know of in the United States is Mary Star of the Sea, at LaJolla, near San Diego. And there are others. A recent encomium comes from the pen of the editor of our esteemed contemporary, *Caecilia* (September, 1943) concerning the fine work accomplished in the Archdiocese of Los Angeles in the field of liturgical music. The editor of *Caecilia* notes the encouragement given to all and sundry by the Archbishop of Los Angeles, the Most Reverend John J. Cantwell, and also alludes to the splendid work done by the archdiocesan director of music, the Reverend Robert Brennan. In an article on "Rules and Regulations" John J. Devlin notes that "many of the hoary customs impeding liturgical reform elsewhere, do not exist in our midst"

(that is one of the blessings of not being overburdened by traditions) and therefore, "The mention of 'Solemes' may not yet convey a particularly clear notion in some quarters, but at least no explosion greets its pronouncement." How fortunate it would be for all of us if the same limpid frame of mind could induce certain of our milquetoasts from being so disturbed at the mention of the word *modern*!—LITURGICAL ARTS, New York, N. Y., November, 1943.

High Schools and Citizens

THEY go to high school. And why? Theoretically, high school is meant to work on their extremely impressionable natures and be a strong influence in making them "good citizens." If this phrase means anything at all, it means men and women who can take their places in society, not only with the grace and culture and practical efficiency that distinguishes the well-trained but also with that deep sense of moral idealism without which there is no true education. Unless the young learn this lesson in high school: that they have responsibilities as well as privileges, duties as well as rights; that they cannot sidestep or ignore either—then they have missed the most important good of education.

That an appalling number of boys and girls are getting from high school no help toward good citizenship but in some cases even the reverse seems apparent from the frequency of crime among high school students and graduates. Thoughtful and responsible men and women are concerned over "the unprecedented wave of juvenile delinquency sweeping over the nation." Of course, the full blame for this state of affairs cannot justly be thrown into the lap of the high schools; indeed, the greater sin lies in the lack of proper home training, in the indifference, sometimes in the positive example of crookedness and dissoluteness given by parents; but the high school itself cannot escape a share of the responsibility.

The longstanding policy of the public schools in America to ignore religion in the educational program is bearing ugly fruit today. Perhaps it is a mistaken sense of trying to be fair to all creeds that has dictated the expedient of barring religion altogether from the classrooms of these schools, but it is a notion that sadly misinterprets human nature. No morality, public or private, that does not rest firmly on religious foundations, can endure. The records of our courts are shocking proof that this truth, cited also by the founders of our country, is incontestible.

Catholics may well feel recompensed for the sacrifices they have made in establishing and supporting an independent secondary school sys-

tem. Without being pharisaical, they can rest assured that in Catholic high schools their children will be taught the principles of sound moral conduct. Deep religious convictions gained during school hours are carried by the young into their homes and into their social lives, and make them better citizens. Court records show that Catholic grade schools and high schools are among the most effective crime-preventing institutions in the land. Of Catholic boys and girls brought before the courts only a small percent have ever attended Catholic schools. In one recent survey involving girls only and covering a period of nine months, only four per cent had ever gone to Catholic schools. — XAVERIAN BROTHERS AUXILIARY BULLETIN, *Silver Spring, Md., December, 1943.*

A Church's Plan for Rural Living

PLANS concerning the farmer and his place in a peace-time world most fitly come from farming regions of a tall corn state, where the land is a proved way of life. The National Catholic Rural Life Conference has its administrative headquarters in Des Moines, where the executive and advisory board has lately held a war-time meeting. The principles and methods adapted are comprehensively stated in a pamphlet entitled "Rural Living in a Peaceful World." Starting from the unassailable premise that the only way to recover from a total war

is by a total peace, the conference takes its stand on the principle that "sound agrarianism is an essential element for the making of such a peace." And it points out that postwar planning, so far, has had little to say regarding the future problems of rural life.

The conference outlines its own program which will, we believe, win appreciation and applause. It is comprehensive, sane and far-seeing. It works for that essential fulfillment of democracy which a life of freedom and security on the land can accomplish and which history has many times instanced cities and sidewalks cannot give. Our nation, "conceived in liberty," was founded upon an agrarian basis. It was true then and it is still true, that "he who owns land breathes the air of a free man." We have necessarily arrived far from this Jeffersonian concept of an agrarian civilization in a land of wide spaces and small population. Cities have arisen on acres which were owned and tilled, and industries have taken for productive use hands which held the plow. Yet the large acreage of land tilled and tillable in our forty-eight states still leaves life upon the soil the most vital part of our national economy and well-being. This industry of mother earth will be more than ever important when the war ends—as the conference points out. Hunger is certain to stalk through lands where there has been devastation of farms, slaughter of herds and enslavement of popu-

lations. Our own agricultural program must be such that we can answer the needs of these war-stricken lands whose destruction and impoverishment we have escaped.

All of the conference planning is toward a future where a maximum population will live on the soil. It condemns any nationalizing or collectivizing of land and urges that life upon the farm where the family gains all or part of its subsistence from home acres. Toward such a wished-for end, the National Catholic Rural Life Conference calls upon the farmer to build up within himself an understanding of his high calling. And with the ringing wisdom of a great Church it terms the farmer's way of life a sacred one—making him a "partner of God" and that earth he owns and tills "a holy land."—NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE, February 5, 1944.

Outlawing Prejudice

IN opposing legislation to ban from the mails literature or pictures which stir up racial or religious animosity, the Postoffice Department maintains that such a law would be all but impossible to enforce, would violate the principle of free speech, would be unconstitutional, would increase rather than diminish prejudice and controversy, and would raise vexing questions as to just what could be classified as a breach of the law.

The department is certainly marshalling as strong a case as possible

against the legislation. One can understand the almost insuperable administrative difficulties which it would impose on the Postoffice: the protests, the wrangling, the crossfire of charges and counter-charges. The precedent established by the Supreme Court in its latest decisions in cases involving the Jehovah Witnesses makes it look as if such a law would be held unconstitutional. These queer people assiduously spread defamation of Catholicism and Catholics, and the highest court in the land has ruled that the principle of free speech requires that they be unmolested and unimpeded in their prejudicial endeavor.

Jews have told us that the circulation of anti-Semitic trash by mail is on the increase. We can testify to the amazing amount of anti-Catholic lit-

erature which is sent through the mails. Samples of it are forwarded to us by indignant recipients several times a week. These facts make one very angry. But what is most startling is the evident labor and expense to which hate-mongers go in order to spread their poison.

It is deplorable that the mails should be put to such use. But we can see how tremendous a task the proposed legislation would saddle on the Postoffice. The real solution to this ghastly practice lies in the desperately needed moral education of a great many Americans. The suggested law would really be only a flimsy net designed to catch and contain a tornado. Prohibitory and penal measures cannot cope with a spiritual illness. —THE CATHOLIC TRANSCRIPT, Hartford, Conn., November 25, 1943.



The Natural Law

The Natural Law may be compared to a man reading mandatory instructions from a signboard: the precepts of the Natural Law are the mandatory instructions on the board; the board itself is man's nature which, when scrutinized in all its aspects, aptitudes and tendencies, yields the knowledge of the law; and the observer is man's reason reading the law in his nature, not as originating there, but as indicated there by the supreme Law-giver.—T. Bouscaren, S.J. in *THE MODERN SCHOOLMAN*, November, 1939.

A Revisionist Approach to Hispanic American Studies

RICHARD PATTEE

Presidential Address delivered at the Twenty-fourth Annual Meeting of the American Catholic Historical Association, New York, N. Y., December 29, 1943.

*Reprinted from The CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW**

I AM inclined to believe that times like those in which we live are not particularly propitious for papers which are purely erudite or which deal with historical problems, interesting in themselves, but somewhat remote from the realities of the day. Dr. Martin R. P. McGuire in his address last year on this same occasion performed a useful and necessary task in calling our attention once more to certain questions of historical interest in the world in which we live, which need to be repeated again and again. I believe that the situation this year is no different, and for this reason I have chosen as the topic for my presidential address the problem of revisionism in the approach to the history of the Hispanic American peoples. I mean by revisionism something quite simple: the need for readjusting our interpretation of the realities of Hispanic America, and, more particularly, the definite need for revamping certain concepts which I believe have warped and distorted much of our understanding of that area.

I have chosen this topic of Hispanic America for two reasons: first,

because it happens to be the special field of interest to which I have devoted some slight attention during the past years; and secondly, because the knowledge of that area is part and parcel of the present foreign policy of this country and must remain so no matter what modifications may be adopted in the future. The international interests of the United States are bound up in a peculiarly intimate way with those of the other American republics and even our most rabid isolationists, whose vision of the world is limited by the dimensions of their county or electoral district, have come to the point where America means something more than Nebraska or Iowa. It is encouraging that this particular sector of public opinion has come to include the other republics of this hemisphere in their conception of the area of legitimate American interest. The recent controversy aroused in this country and abroad by the declarations of Senator Hugh Butler reveal that sooner or later the Latin-American policy is bound to become a debatable issue. Controversy over its merits cannot be long delayed.

* The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C., January, 1944.

The so-called policy of the Good Neighbor which has flourished for these past thirteen years has probably won more universal approval than almost any other aspect of foreign policy under any of our presidential administrations. That does not mean, to be sure, that it will not be submitted to the most severe criticism. The accusations against it will be the same as those levelled against the domestic policy of the present executive and against his alleged "interventionism," the term so commonly applied to the almost clairvoyant ability of the President to grasp the implications of the world conditions under which we are now living. For this reason, I am convinced that we are destined definitely to be deeply concerned about Latin America, The area, which prior to 1900 figured so slightly in our international thinking, will certainly acquire increasing importance through the years as one of the pivotal points of the foreign policy of the United States.

LATIN AMERICAN HISTORY

If this is true, then it is obviously important that as historians we learn to find our way through the historical evolution of the twenty peoples who constitute the other American republics. I do not know if my colleagues in this particular field agree with me or not, but I am quite convinced that the manner of presentation of the essential elements in the history of these people to our American students

leaves a great deal to be desired. I would go further and say that I doubt if any other field of current historical interest is presented so badly, ineffectively, or less interestingly. The greater portion of the texts in this field which circulate are enough to deaden even the liveliest interest in what is essentially a fairly interesting field. Curiously enough, in almost every other aspect of historical scholarship we have gone far beyond the point where history meant politics and politics means the change of presidential administrations and the various and sundry activities of the persons who happened to hold high office at a given moment. Latin-American history has not gone much beyond this as yet. I have claimed for a long time that of all the arid, uninspiring and fundamentally useless subjects to which the attention of a student may be drawn, none can equal the political history of a given Hispanic-American republic.

In the first place they are all alike and can be reduced merely to an endless chronology of names, dates and changes. I see no point in giving more than the most cursory attention to such phenomena as the rise and fall, change and reshifting of presidents in Paraguay, Honduras, or Guatemala. The same may be said of the constitutions. I recall a correspondence I had some years ago with a gentleman who was on his way to Bolivia to study the constitutional history of that republic. I am afraid that I replied to his letter in a somewhat face-

tious vain, stating that I found it difficult to understand why anyone would waste his time and a foundation's money in the study of something that was so theoretical and unrealistic as the constitutions of Bolivia. None of them ever fitted the needs of the country, all of them have been more or less bad translations of similar documents somewhere else, and few of them have been seriously put into practice. As a real historical problem, the study of the constitutions of that country would give one no insight whatsoever into the life, vicissitudes and character of the Bolivian people.

I cite this example merely to introduce the topic of this paper, namely, that it is high time we gave some attention to the realities of Latin America and to reappraise and re-evaluate many of the attitudes and approaches which heretofore have been conventional and stereotyped. An intelligent Latin-American policy in the United States depends on such an appraisal. We have made remarkably little progress in this direction. We have been content to repeat the usual things, stress the usual points and inflict on our students a type of Latin-American history which is enough to make them gag.

I suggested a moment ago that in the long run the policy of America in this field depends in large measure on the type of information our people get concerning the other American peoples. I would propose that there are two very broad assump-

tions which inevitably lead to serious confusion. The first is to pattern the history of Latin America on that of the United States or, to express it better, to employ the United States as a pattern or model or background against which to set the evolution of these peoples. The second error in orientation, to which reference has already been made, is to assign to political events and developments the same importance that is given them in the United States or Great Britain.

The history of the other American republics is full of the same nomenclature as that of the United States. Constitution, amendments, congress, bill of rights, president, cabinet, etc., all the terms are there and the assumption is that they mean the same thing. We suffer the illusion of an apparent similarity when the reality is very different. It is perfectly evident that while the external trappings of republican government and of constitutional practice have been the same, the basic realities underlying that surface are so different as to belong to another world. In the name of continental solidarity and hemispheric unity, we should not commit the error of ascribing similarities that do not exist or analogies that are only apparent.

I suggest that Latin-American history be approached as something *sui generis*, the analogies of which with either Europe or the United States are only slight. Latin America is, in reality, something absolutely

novel in the modern world. No other entire continent in modern times has broken away from its colonial ties to constitute itself as independent. No other area as vast can be found anywhere in which three major races have mixed their bloods and sought to develop nationalities which are based on the most complete and wide-spread miscegenation. No other area of the world of similar proportions possesses the same essentially uniform culture, language and religion. In other words, neither Europe nor the United States provides a successful counterpart to explain the internal and intimate development of these peoples.

For this and other reasons, I believe that political history is the least important aspect in the study of Latin America. We are only beginning to have access to information extensive enough to form accurate judgments on the social, economic and cultural history of the area. I believe much of the disrespect for the Latin Americans which unquestionably exists in the United States emanates from this idea that their politics are tumultuous and anarchical, their constitutions mere pieces of paper, and their presidents subject to ejection periodically by violent means. In other words, the criterion of political maturity has been set up as the one measure of appraisal. Nothing could be more erroneous. It is true that Latin-American politics has followed this general course, but underneath this turbulent exterior are

forces of stability, normality and progress which have flourished in spite of the political crust which is so given to this constant heaving.

EXAMINE SOME POINTS

Suppose we examine now a number of specific points or aspects of the history of Hispanic America which I believe require reanalysis and reexamination. I should say that the first are the terms republicanism and democracy. The terms are hard enough to define anywhere and are particularly so when applied to peoples of diverse origin and experience. Is Latin America since independence in 1825 democratic in the sense that we use the word? Has republicanism, which is the visible form of government, actually taken root as the type of political organization most responsive to the needs of the people concerned? Did those nations which adopted for a longer or a shorter period of time the monarchical system commit a hopeless folly or did they reveal a sense of political intuition unequalled by those who were carried away by the vision of republican institutions?

I would propose these as problems of a very fundamental nature which ought to be examined quite candidly and objectively, since they are underlying premises to much that we are saying and thinking today in terms of inter-American relations.

It goes without saying that we have given the word democracy a most limited meaning. I wonder if we

do not mean frequently merely the privilege of going to the polls on the first Tuesday after the first Monday of each November to deposit our vote for this or that candidate. If this is the case, I dare say that Latin America is far from approaching anything like democracy. However, in the broader sense which shall include very definitely the social and economic, Latin America has something fairly positive to offer. It would be encouraging to have much more attention concentrated on the achievements in the way of social democracy in as vast and complex a country as Brazil where racial assimilation has made great progress, rather than on this superficial and irrelevant emphasis on the democratic structure of the Hispanic-American republics.

A problem which merits the most serious attention is that of the nature of the institutions in the light of the *milieu*, experience and character of the people. Extravagant romanticists of the type of Juan Montalvo of Ecuador have tended to insist that there are ideal forms of political and social life which should be adopted regardless of the peculiar conditions which may prevail in a given country. The problem of whether republicanism was adequate after the confusion and welter of the wars of emancipation is both pertinent and even actual. We in America have a curious and often unexplainable complex about the word monarchy. We are possessed with the idea that if a government

calls itself republican and elects a president it is necessarily more benevolent, more responsive to public will, and in general more basically representative than if monarchical.

One of the problems that has long intrigued me, however, is the comparison between monarchical Brazil and Spanish America as a study in contrast between the prematurity and precipitateness of republicanism and the logical transition from colony to monarchy. The problem is full of interesting possibilities which ought to be explored. For a long time the name of Agustin de Iturbide has been anathema to the conventional and official historians of Mexico, primarily because he did not believe in a republic as the source of all blessings. It will be recalled that this extraordinary leader, the real founder of Mexico as such, stated his case cogently and pithily under three principles: monarchism, union of Mexicans and Spaniards, and the recognition of the Catholic faith as dominant.

This relatively simple program, lacking completely in republican eloquence, and known as the Plan of Iguala, constituted, it seems to me, a fairly reasonable basis for the existence of independent Mexico in 1821. Nevertheless the name of Iturbide has been erased from Mexican history, and his reputation besmirched as the representative of intrigue, unbridled ambition and political chicanery. I suggest that here one has a type of problem that demands revision because of

the conventionalized interpretation that has been given the course of events.

Another phase of Hispanic American history which certainly demands an attitude of revisionism is the whole period of independence. Reams of paper have been devoted to almost every aspect of the military, political and diplomatic history of this time. I submit, however, that the really important problems have been treated very inadequately, if at all. What was the real object of the independence movement in Hispanic America? What were the currents at work within the vast confines of Mexico, Central and South America before 1810? What did most of the responsible leaders actually want for their peoples? Was the movement motivated by animosity against Spain and the Spanish as is usually depicted?

In posing these questions, we are striking, of course, at the basic problems of the historical interpretation of all of the Americas discovered and colonized by Spain. The process of revisionism in the case of the colonial period has made and continues to make satisfactory progress. Item by item, piece by piece, the framework of a valid and authentic interpretation is being built up.

The extremely important studies of Dr. Irving Leonard of the University of Michigan, in revealing the very active commerce in books with Spanish America, helps to overcome once and for all the myth of the ob-

scurantism of the Spanish colonies in the new world. The vehement and often impassioned studies of Father Constantino Bayle in Spain, in spite of their obvious efforts to make a case, do shed valuable light on the education and intellectual situation in the colonies. It would be out of place to cite name after name of those who have contributed to this task. I am more concerned in this paper with the nineteenth century in Hispanic America.

MUST START AT BEGINNING

It is important, however, in the name of historical continuity to recognize that revisionism must start at the beginning. So much mythology and legend have accumulated that the task is singularly difficult. The motives and even the chronology of the wars of independence demand a careful reorientation. The studies of the Frenchman, Marius André, set the pace for a very fundamental revisionism in showing that the wars were very far from being the result of the influence of the French Revolution and its ideas and were rather a serious and coordinated effort against it.

The same may be said of the role of the clergy in these vast movements. If anything requires a revision in thinking and in appraisal, it is the place and influence of the Catholic clergy in almost every aspect of the national life of the Latin-American states. We are still under the influence of those who have classified people as

belonging to two classes: liberals, who have a monopoly on all phases of forward thinking; and reactionaries, who constitute all of those whom the liberals do not like.

This facile classification has colored very definitely much of the writing on Hispanic America. How many of our current texts give any other picture of the wars of independence than as a movement of enlightenment against forces which sought to keep the colonies in bondage, and among those forces were, of course, the aristocracy, the clergy and the privileged minorities? Where do we find reference specifically to the fact that practically all of the great leaders of this emancipation were aristocrats and that the clergy and hierarchy were divided in sentiment as they are likely to be in almost every similar case? When will it be possible to convince others, that we, as Catholics, in spite of our dogmatic unity, do have the right to disagree on innumerable matters, and that perhaps the tragedy often is that we agree on so very few things?

Possibly if the restrictions were really there, we might more ably present a united front at times when it is so badly needed. And so it happened at the beginning of the last century throughout Hispanic America. The Bishop of Quito presided over a revolutionary committee; the Bishop of Pasto in southern New Granada, cheek by jowl, so to speak, with his Granadine colleague, was a violent and unrepentant royalist. The

famous Congress of Tucuman in the Argentine provinces in 1816 has been labelled correctly as almost a theological assembly, so prominent was the influence of the clergy and so decisive its prestige. Time does not permit a listing of many similar cases. I merely bring these particular problems to your attention to emphasize my thesis, namely, that it is time we recheck ideas about such important epochs as the independence of Hispanic America, because from this period stems almost everything that distinguishes and characterizes the nineteenth century.

Together with the questions I have just suggested there are others to which attention might be called and which are equally subject to a revisionist attitude: the problem of foreign influence at work, and the state of economic and political affairs in Spanish America when the wars broke out. Much has been said of French influence and little has been said of the tremendous influence of Jeremy Bentham. Latin America has always been subject to exotic influences that often find more fertile soil in these countries than in the country of their origin.

It is no accident that positivism flourished in Brazil after Auguste Comte was no longer read by anyone except graduate students working on their dissertations. It is no accident either that Marxism, undiluted or in emasculated form, has managed to win considerable audiences in Hispanic America. The movement of

ideas is a most intriguing phase of the political, social and intellectual history of this area during the past century. Full of anachronisms, misapplications and distortions, one is apt to find survivals which are almost folkloristic in character.

The state of Spanish America in 1810 is still open to every type of analysis. It is strange that as important a point as this should still remain unelucidated in spite of these many years of concern with the problem. I submit, nevertheless, that what Albert Mathiez did for the France of 1789 ought to be done for Hispanic America. After all these years of believing that France on the eve of the Revolution was in a state of virtual chaos economically, we discover now that this was not the case at all. We are presented convincing evidence that the economic life of France, if somewhat disjointed, was at least potentially capable of a healthy reaction and far from the collapse which has generally been depicted. Would that more of our students of Hispanic-American affairs would read Alexander von Humboldt. Unhappily these older writers are little read in our days. Yet somehow I am convinced that Humboldt must know more about the New Spain of the first decade of the nineteenth century than almost any of those who came after him. We should begin this necessary revisionism by revising the list of books we read and the authors we consult.

I spoke a few moments ago of

the difficult problem of evaluating the place of the clergy and of the Church. The nineteenth century is the perfect example of the incomprehension of this problem and its implications. The liberal vs. conservative tradition has done incalculable harm in this respect by confusing the issue and by making clear judgments more difficult. I would not deny, of course, that we have had our share of responsibility in this confusion. However, I would urge that the religious problem be considered as one of the first to require careful and patient reexamination.

CHURCH AND STATE

How much attention, for example, is devoted in our texts to the problem of the *Patronato Real*? One may say that this is no more than an academic problem belonging to the past centuries with no reality and no warmth of actuality. I would say that there is no single problem more extraordinarily actual than this, because on its understanding depends almost every aspect of the Church, the State in its relations to the Church, and the problem of religion and religious influence in Hispanic America in general.

Everything that the Church was and did in Hispanic America rested definitely on this juridical basis. The royal patronage, which developed from the period of the reconquest in the Iberian peninsula, determined the existence of the Church in America and set up the conditions under which

it was to evangelize the new world. The interference of the State in almost every phase of ecclesiastical life was no accident but the consequence of definite legal regulations. The assertion of the independent governments that the new regimes had the same rights and privileges as the Spanish crown set the stage for many of the internecine struggles in the past century into which the Church was definitely drawn. The claims and counterclaims regarding the application of the *Patronato* and its legality are the basis of much of the anti-clericalism which has distinguished the history of all too many of the republics. It is indispensable to understand these legal intricacies. To dismiss them as merely quibbling or the wrangling of jurists over minute and subtle points of interpretation is to miss the significance of the issue entirely.

I would almost go so far as to assert that the best introduction to the study of the history of Hispanic America is some knowledge of Spanish law and jurisprudence. As a people peculiarly gifted with a love of juridical dialectics, an appreciation of the place of the legal codes and institutions in all phases of the national life is extremely useful. I would go even further and say that if I were to choose the works which I believe to be absolutely essential to the understanding of the realities of the mind and temperament of the Latin-American peoples, I would, without hesitation, select the *Quijote* and the *Siete*

Partidas. Neither belongs to America and both do. What may appear to you to be a flippancy or an attempt at a *bon mot* involves a very real truth. Hispanic America has been dominated by the heritage and tradition of Spain. The *Patronato* is an excellent example. Yet, how little is it studied or even mentioned except in passing and, as a result, what do we have? An enormous preoccupation with the deleterious influence of the Church, with its incapacity to respond to the times, its conservatism and its deadening influence on the social development of the peoples.

Instead of clarifying the singularly unsatisfactory relations of Church and State in the period under discussion, which led, not to the supremacy and domination of the Church as is commonly believed, but to the exact contrary, i.e. to its subjection to the state in every detail of its life, much ink and effort are devoted to enumerating the number of monasteries and adding up the alleged wealth of the Church in terms of properties. Instead of recognizing that in the fields of education and human welfare the Church bore the almost exclusive burden for centuries, the accusation is made that the Church did not do enough and it was high time that the State, heretofore largely indifferent to the whole problem, be given charge. The process of enumerating these problems is infinite. Time is too short to do more than call your attention to the place of revisionism in a field

which has become increasingly popular, but which still is an almost virgin forest which is yet to be penetrated.

The study of Hispanic-American history in the United States is certainly far from satisfactory. It is not without importance to note that in spite of the tremendous interest evinced in this field during the past five or six years, scarcely a single book of permanent importance has been published. I do not refer to the popular and semi-popular tracts that describe the production of rubber in the Acre territory or the number of Nazi airfields in Colombia, but to serious works that will stand the test of the next few years and will be permanent contributions to our knowledge of Hispanic America.

It is a sad commentary that in general we are not raising up the type of penetrating scholar to cope with these and a multitude of other problems. There are, of course, notable and praiseworthy exceptions, but on the whole, I see no reason for us to be content with the work being done. I attribute it in part to the absurd division of work according to "fields." If any word has come to have a positively obnoxious connotation it is the word "field." Unfortunately it means in the world of scholarship exactly what it means in agriculture—a fencing off of a piece of land in which the individual works without curiosity or desire to penetrate beyond. Not only does the individual establish himself behind his little self-erected fence,

to the cultivation of whose soil he devotes himself with more or less profit, but he acquires a singularly proprietary feeling which resents the appearance of any other individual who may desire to till the same piece of land. Hence we have the inevitable consequence of this parcelling and fractioning of the whole area. We have monographs and dissertations and articles and studies and no vision. We have footnotes and no intuition. We have a breakdown with no synthesis. We have the isolated without the complete.

Jacques Maritain has recently remarked that we in the United States have limitless energy and boundless zest for achievement but we are lacking in contemplation and intuition. I feel very keenly that in the Hispanic field we have lost the sense of intuition, if indeed we ever had it, and have substituted for it the product of industry which leaves us with material but no understanding. We might well reflect that we have not come so very far from the days of Prescott, Irving, or Ticknor.

I think much of the fault lies in our exaggerated sense of the scholarly. We are afraid to be labelled as amateurs and dilettantes. We are afraid to reveal a thought about anything that is outside the specific, restricted area in which we have published a treatise and in which we are judged supreme. I wonder if we do not often select a field in which to reign unchallenged that is so arid and so ster-

ile, that no one else has the slightest desire to enter it. Whatever may be the case, and I am referring concretely to the study of Hispanic America, there must come a change in this attitude or we are destined to continue producing without enriching, digging without extracting, learning without understanding.

The Hispanic field is a unit as is every other. We who are supposed to be Hispanists strive to understand and interpret to our students, or other innocents, some sense of what the Hispanic peoples are like and what their culture means in the world. Nothing is more difficult than the interpretation of the culture of a people or its genius by a non-national. None of the various disciplines to which we devote ourselves can be strictly separated. For this reason, I believe profoundly that in order to advance the cause of Hispanic scholarship in this country, we urgently need more synthesis and less analysis.

Language, letters, history and thought are all part of the same thing. How discouraging it is to find those who occupy themselves with Hispanic history and have never read a Hispanic-American novel. How equally disconcerting are those who belong to the fraternity of students of literature and find ample satisfaction in the heaping up of bibliographical chits with no inkling or even curiosity about what is in the books so recorded. How many of those who count the number of times a given

author uses *lo* or *le* have any real enthusiasm for the content of the author so dissected? How many of those who are diligent in pursuing the minute fact, in determining where a given personage lodged on a given night, have any sense of the social and economic forces that are at work in Hispanic America? How many are there among our Hispanic Americanists who attempt to grasp the spiritual and permanent values in the culture of the nation which gave birth to these new nationalities, Spain itself?

If the relations of our country with the other American republics are to be based on something more than maudlin sentimentality, if the exigencies of the present moments are to produce lasting and mutually satisfactory relations that will endure after the conclusion of the war, it behooves us logically to re-examine the past of the peoples, with whom we are dealing, to evaluate their history, and rid ourselves of many of the misconceptions we have acquired. This task means that a salutary revision of our interpretation of Hispanic American history is indispensable and urgent. It should be accompanied by this larger task which is directly the obligation of those of us who belong to the world of scholarship, to think in broader terms and see things as a whole. As Catholic historians this obligation is almost peremptory, for of all the segments of our population we, implicitly, belong to the most universal.

Social Reform

FRANK O'GORMAN

*Reprinted from The IRISH CATHOLIC**

HAVING had occasion to explain the use of the contraction "cf." to the rising generation recently, I fell to musing on the depressing influence of the same "cf." on my schooldays. I refer, of course, to the sign which urges the student to compare the portion of Horace or Virgil or Shakespeare which he is supposed to be studying with some very uninteresting story elsewhere. I recall that by telling me "cf. Odes, 2, 12" the editor of my book of Horace fondly hoped to recall some beloved and familiar passage. Usually those "cf.'s" were boring because there appeared to be no valid reason for looking up the passage in question unless under compulsion. When good students were told to "cf." they did see, and duly conquered.

One of the "cf.'s" sticks in my mind, but not for the reason intended by the learned editor. The reference is "cf. the story of Sisyphus." For one thing the classical name was irreverently but gleefully changed to "Sissy-Puss." But the story itself is worth remembering too.

Sisyphus was a character of Greek mythology famous for his craftiness. When Death came to fetch him, Sisyphus put him in fetters so that nobody died until Death broke

prison. Even then Sisyphus was not baffled and managed to get back to life again on the plea of laying down the law to his wife who had neglected her duty. In the end, however, the crafty one was caught and punished in the under world by being compelled to roll a big stone up a steep hill. The task was slightly complicated by the fact that before the stone reached the top of the hill it always rolled down again and so Sisyphus had to begin all over again.

I have often imagined the reactions of the inhabitants of the lower world, as they watched Sisyphus at his task—if classical mythology allows such a diversion. There would be some to say: "Poor old Sisyphus will do it yet. There's a mighty heave!" There would be others, too, with eyes for nothing but the rolling back of the stone, who would say: "He has tried that before. It won't succeed this time either."

If you dislike having a moral pointed out to you in a story, you had better stop reading here. My moral is directed to some people who may be in error about social reform. There are those who look for the coming of a new day, which would be all noon-day sun and no morning or evening. And there are others who consider

* 36, Upper Ormond Quay, Dublin, Ireland.

that a good and hopeful word about social reform would stick in their throats like Macbeth's Amen.

For one class the success of a new scheme will be glorious, complete and permanent; for the other, its failure is a foregone conclusion. This man tells us that his scheme will put the country on its feet again; the other assures us that nothing can be done except to endure the suffering and misery—of other people.

"To suffer and endure is the lot of humanity; let them strive as they may, no strength and no artifice will ever succeed in banishing from human life the ills and troubles which beset it. . ." No, this is not a quotation

from a *laissez-faire* pulpiter. It comes from a document which, a generation ago, urged all men to take part in social reform. . . . "Everyone should put his hand to the work which falls to his share, and that at once and straightway, lest the evil which is already so great become through delay absolutely beyond remedy. . . . Those who rule the State . . . masters and wealthy owners . . . the working classes . . . every minister of holy religion. . ."

And if such a solution pleased Leo XIII and, after him, Pius X, Benedict XV, Pius XI and Pius XII there is something to be said for the social reformer after all.



The Christian Family

Since the Christian family is the unit of the Christian civilization, if that unit is in danger of destruction so also is the civilization itself. That such a danger does exist must be clear to the most casual observer of the times. Only within the Catholic Church is the Christian family free from the germ which has been steadily attacking it for the past two hundred years in the non-Catholic world. This germ is divorce. Divorce, its possibility and facility, must inevitably, if allowed to continue, utterly destroy the Christian family, and with its destruction must go the civilization which it instituted.—*Charles L. Judah, S.J. in CATHOLIC OPINION, Kingston, Jamaica, December 19, 1944.*

Voluntary Arbitration

REV. JOHN P. BOLAND

*Address delivered before the New York State Industrial Convention, Buffalo, N. Y.,
October 29, 1943*

THE most important difference between civilization and savagery is the habitual willingness of civilized men and nations to submit their differences of opinion to a factual test. It is a mark of civilization to present reasons rather than arms. As we become readier, by habit, to persuade or be persuaded, we grow more civilized. We need not be less aggressive in our search for facts, less militant in offering them, less sincere in seeing their value. But we must be quick to admit that a stronger array of facts than ours renders our opinion untenable. We surrender through conviction. In this there is no greater loss of prestige of possessions than there is in acknowledging that two and two make four. The ability to persuade and a corresponding willingness to be persuaded after peaceful discussion in an atmosphere of mutual respect is but the final triumph of mind over brute force. That is the road to personal freedom.

We have reached this high point of intellectual honesty in our civil and criminal court practice. It is because we have missed its attainment in our international relations that we are presently engaged in warring against barbaric proponents of the baser rule of compulsion, violence, the imposition of opinion by superior strength.

We are not far from our goal of lifting facts above empty cupidity in the settlement of disputes that arise between labor and management. Direct negotiation of contracts between organizations of workers and their employers is accepted procedure in America today. So is the submission of unfinished issues and the unfolding of facts to sustain or deny them. The first is pure discussion, ideal, attainable—the play of proposal, counterproposal and agreement. The second involves the selection of a third neutral party, competent and impartial, a panel of arbitrators or an arbitrator. They are complementary one to the other.

It is proper to address your group on the subject of expanding the use of arbitration, for you have been from your beginnings, enthusiastic believers in the justice of your claims and intelligent exponents of the reasons on which they are based, and, therefore, unafraid of the decisions of an informed umpire. I take it that this can be said also of the firms with which you deal.

That is not all. You are well aware that industrial disputes in wartime generate a host of impediments to full production and quick delivery of the goods our fighting men must have in overflowing abundance if they are to outpoint a resourceful en-

emy. Angry arguments over a workbench, the ill-will that follows if they are not quickly settled, the resulting lack of confidence, an air of mutual distrust, all these states of mind can wind up in almost anything—indifference to quota schedules, slow downs, treasonable obstruction, sabotage. The only control that one can call democratic is early settlement of the disputes, day by day adjudication of cases, immediate submission, hearing of evidence and handing down of awards, through the use of an alert arbitrator's services.

A DEMOCRATIC CURE

Whether the dispute be current and existing or a future and unpredictable one, arbitration, freely elected by both parties before an arbitrator who is acceptable to both, arbitration that is purely voluntary, arbitration that is final in its award, because the parties so declare beforehand, is at once a democratic cure and a measure of prevention.

It is pleasant to recall that your National President, Philip Murray, said to you not long ago, "All contracts that do not have an arbitration provision should immediately incorporate one" therein. He called for a "forthright declaration that all issues arising under existing agreements be disposed of by voluntary arbitration." He was moved to offer this counsel by the same patriotic urge that impels you and me and all of us to clamor not only for a just settlement of all

disputes but also, and primarily, that disputes and their settlement be removed from the category of interference with production for victory.

Worthy of note, too, at this point, is the stand which the National War Labor Board, itself engaged in compulsory arbitration, takes toward the kind of arbitration, voluntary arbitration, about which I have been talking. Last July first, by unanimous vote, that Board reaffirmed its policy of encouraging the settlement of disputes by voluntary arbitration if and when the first steps in the procedure of handling local grievances fail. And on July 24, it advised labor and management to continue to the fullest possible degree the practice of self-regulation, the last step of which, after direct conciliation has proved unsuccessful, is the calling in of a third party to whom the facts in their entirety are given for his consideration and decision.

I speak of voluntary arbitration because, outside of a national emergency like war, I am opposed to the exercise of compulsory powers in industry. I am opposed to the imposition from above, without my consent, and without my participation by vote in his selection, of an arbiter of my economic destiny. I speak of a normal device for normal times. I am thinking, too, of the days ahead when unions like yours will be negotiating—as some of your unions presently do—as the chosen representatives in collective bargaining of all the employees

in a given industry with representatives of all firms and managements in the same industry. I am thinking of standard clauses covering grievance machinery and its speedy functioning—when the experimental days are over. I have visions of industry-wide peace based not only on the prohibitive cost of stoppages but also, and principally, on the shelving of most stoppages because good, hard-headed impartial arbitration is within instant reach.

It is quite unnecessary for me to add that arbitration need not be government-supplied. In fact, most of the 100,000 submissions to arbitration made in 1942, perhaps eighty-five per cent of them, were placed in the capable hands of private individuals or agencies without official connections. We are most fortunate in possessing one such unofficial agency, which, for a quarter of a century, has done nothing but arbitration in almost all of its forms, commercial, international and labor. It is ready formed, it is handy, having 7,000 names on its list in 1600 communities, and it is willing. Perhaps, the only questions which potential applicants for arbitration need ask are: 1) Does this neutral know my industry and its operations; and 2) Is he habitually impartial?

The agency, to which I referred just now, undertakes to supply men who have achieved a reputation for judicial-mindedness and can offer the services of arbitrators from practically all trades and callings. The danger of

losing a case because the arbitrator colors the facts you put before him with his own social philosophy or because he is financially or out of friendship interested in his own award or because he is mentally incapable of grasping and weighing the facts, is no greater than it would be if the case were brought to the regular courts. The safeguards which the Association exercises when a party requests them, are reasonably adequate. There is hardly any objection which you may raise against arbitration which you may not also raise against the courts. Its advantages are the arbitrator's greater familiarity with the background of the disputes if he is picked for his knowledge of the industry's practice and history, and the acceleration of the processes of gathering the evidence and rendering a decision. Where the parties have agreed, the finality of the award is the same.

GOOD LABOR POLICY

I have been speaking about the American Arbitration Association, healthy, lively, growing organization built on American principles and full of American hopes for the future of America and of the world. I commend its program to you and particularly its standard contract clause on the handling of grievances. It reads: "Any dispute, claim, grievance or difference arising out of or relating to this agreement shall be submitted to arbitration, upon notice of either party to the other party, under the

Voluntary Labor Arbitration Rules, then obtaining, of the American Arbitration Association, and the parties agree to abide by the award, subject to such rules and regulations as any Federal agency having jurisdiction may impose. The parties further agree that there shall be no suspension of work when such dispute arises and while it is in process of arbitration." It does not touch the basic rights of

labor, like the right to recognition or to bargain collectively, or the basic rights of management for that matter.

This is free transference of jurisdiction by the parties when this becomes necessary; this is good labor policy; this is progress in labor relations. When the day comes for continuous peace-time production—may it come soon and stay!—America will be ready to produce at full speed.



Rule of Reason

Voluntary arbitration existed among the inhabitants of ancient India, was carried on by the Greeks and was developed to a high degree of effectiveness by the Romans. It was warmly commended by the Fathers of the Church, and a biographer of St. Augustine tells us that the Bishop of Hippo spent whole days at a time hearing and deciding cases in which he had been chosen as arbitrator not only by Christians but by unbelievers as well.

Voluntary arbitration has had, from the beginning, two objectives: 1. To prevent open strife—war between nations, violence between social and economic groups; 2. To avoid tedious expensive and wasteful litigation. These two objectives are, obviously, of the utmost importance in modern relations between labor and management. They are more urgent than ever during this war effort. Direct negotiation of contracts by collective bargaining between labor and management is, thank God, accepted procedure in our country today. But no contract, just as no law, can be written which may not need interpretation. Human language is inadequate, and all possible contingencies cannot be foreseen. Therefore it is wise and necessary to arrange betimes for the peaceful, orderly and expeditious settlement of disputes arising out of the contract.—*From an address by the Very Rev. Thomas J. Tobin at the Oregon State Industrial Union Council Convention, January 8, 1944.*

Voluntary Arbitration

REV. JOHN P. BOLAND

*Address delivered before the New York State Industrial Convention, Buffalo, N. Y.,
October 29, 1943*

THE most important difference between civilization and savagery is the habitual willingness of civilized men and nations to submit their differences of opinion to a factual test. It is a mark of civilization to present reasons rather than arms. As we become readier, by habit, to persuade or be persuaded, we grow more civilized. We need not be less aggressive in our search for facts, less militant in offering them, less sincere in seeing their value. But we must be quick to admit that a stronger array of facts than ours renders our opinion untenable. We surrender through conviction. In this there is no greater loss of prestige of possessions than there is in acknowledging that two and two make four. The ability to persuade and a corresponding willingness to be persuaded after peaceful discussion in an atmosphere of mutual respect is but the final triumph of mind over brute force. That is the road to personal freedom.

We have reached this high point of intellectual honesty in our civil and criminal court practice. It is because we have missed its attainment in our international relations that we are presently engaged in warring against barbaric proponents of the baser rule of compulsion, violence, the imposition of opinion by superior strength.

We are not far from our goal of lifting facts above empty cupidity in the settlement of disputes that arise between labor and management. Direct negotiation of contracts between organizations of workers and their employers is accepted procedure in America today. So is the submission of unfinished issues and the unfolding of facts to sustain or deny them. The first is pure discussion, ideal, attainable—the play of proposal, counterproposal and agreement. The second involves the selection of a third neutral party, competent and impartial, a panel of arbitrators or an arbitrator. They are complementary one to the other.

It is proper to address your group on the subject of expanding the use of arbitration, for you have been from your beginnings, enthusiastic believers in the justice of your claims and intelligent exponents of the reasons on which they are based, and, therefore, unafraid of the decisions of an informed umpire. I take it that this can be said also of the firms with which you deal.

That is not all. You are well aware that industrial disputes in wartime generate a host of impediments to full production and quick delivery of the goods our fighting men must have in overflowing abundance if they are to outpoint a resourceful en-

emy. A
bench,
are no
lack of
distrust
wind u
ence to
treason
only c
cratic
putes,
cases,
of ev
awards
arbitra

V
and e
dictab
by bo
who
that
that i
partie
once
of pr

Natio
said
tracts
provi
porat
"fort
arisin
dispe
He v
the
you
not

emy. Angry arguments over a workbench, the ill-will that follows if they are not quickly settled, the resulting lack of confidence, an air of mutual distrust, all these states of mind can wind up in almost anything—indifference to quota schedules, slow downs, treasonable obstruction, sabotage. The only control that one can call democratic is early settlement of the disputes, day by day adjudication of cases, immediate submission, hearing of evidence and handing down of awards, through the use of an alert arbitrator's services.

A DEMOCRATIC CURE

Whether the dispute be current and existing or a future and unpredictable one, arbitration, freely elected by both parties before an arbitrator who is acceptable to both, arbitration that is purely voluntary, arbitration that is final in its award, because the parties so declare beforehand, is at once a democratic cure and a measure of prevention.

It is pleasant to recall that your National President, Philip Murray, said to you not long ago, "All contracts that do not have an arbitration provision should immediately incorporate one" therein. He called for a "forthright declaration that all issues arising under existing agreements be disposed of by voluntary arbitration." He was moved to offer this counsel by the same patriotic urge that impels you and me and all of us to clamor not only for a just settlement of all

disputes but also, and primarily, that disputes and their settlement be removed from the category of interference with production for victory.

Worthy of note, too, at this point, is the stand which the National War Labor Board, itself engaged in compulsory arbitration, takes toward the kind of arbitration, voluntary arbitration, about which I have been talking. Last July first, by unanimous vote, that Board reaffirmed its policy of encouraging the settlement of disputes by voluntary arbitration if and when the first steps in the procedure of handling local grievances fail. And on July 24, it advised labor and management to continue to the fullest possible degree the practice of self-regulation, the last step of which, after direct conciliation has proved unsuccessful, is the calling in of a third party to whom the facts in their entirety are given for his consideration and decision.

I speak of voluntary arbitration because, outside of a national emergency like war, I am opposed to the exercise of compulsory powers in industry. I am opposed to the imposition from above, without my consent, and without my participation by vote in his selection, of an arbiter of my economic destiny. I speak of a normal device for normal times. I am thinking, too, of the days ahead when unions like yours will be negotiating—as some of your unions presently do—as the chosen representatives in collective bargaining of all the employees

in a given industry with representatives of all firms and managements in the same industry. I am thinking of standard clauses covering grievance machinery and its speedy functioning—when the experimental days are over. I have visions of industry-wide peace based not only on the prohibitive cost of stoppages but also, and principally, on the shelving of most stoppages because good, hard-headed impartial arbitration is within instant reach.

It is quite unnecessary for me to add that arbitration need not be government-supplied. In fact, most of the 100,000 submissions to arbitration made in 1942, perhaps eighty-five per cent of them, were placed in the capable hands of private individuals or agencies without official connections. We are most fortunate in possessing one such unofficial agency, which, for a quarter of a century, has done nothing but arbitration in almost all of its forms, commercial, international and labor. It is ready formed, it is handy, having 7,000 names on its list in 1600 communities, and it is willing. Perhaps, the only questions which potential applicants for arbitration need ask are: 1) Does this neutral know my industry and its operations; and 2) Is he habitually impartial?

The agency, to which I referred just now, undertakes to supply men who have achieved a reputation for judicial-mindedness and can offer the services of arbitrators from practically all trades and callings. The danger of

losing a case because the arbitrator colors the facts you put before him with his own social philosophy or because he is financially or out of friendship interested in his own award or because he is mentally incapable of grasping and weighing the facts, is no greater than it would be if the case were brought to the regular courts. The safeguards which the Association exercises when a party requests them, are reasonably adequate. There is hardly any objection which you may raise against arbitration which you may not also raise against the courts. Its advantages are the arbitrator's greater familiarity with the background of the disputes if he is picked for his knowledge of the industry's practice and history, and the acceleration of the processes of gathering the evidence and rendering a decision. Where the parties have agreed, the finality of the award is the same.

GOOD LABOR POLICY

I have been speaking about the American Arbitration Association, healthy, lively, growing organization built on American principles and full of American hopes for the future of America and of the world. I commend its program to you and particularly its standard contract clause on the handling of grievances. It reads: "Any dispute, claim, grievance or difference arising out of or relating to this agreement shall be submitted to arbitration, upon notice of either party to the other party, under the

Volun
then
bitrati
agree
to su
Feder
may
that
work
while
It do

Voluntary Labor Arbitration Rules, then obtaining, of the American Arbitration Association, and the parties agree to abide by the award, subject to such rules and regulations as any Federal agency having jurisdiction may impose. The parties further agree that there shall be no suspension of work when such dispute arises and while it is in process of arbitration." It does not touch the basic rights of

labor, like the right to recognition or to bargain collectively, or the basic rights of management for that matter.

This is free transference of jurisdiction by the parties when this becomes necessary; this is good labor policy; this is progress in labor relations. When the day comes for continuous peace-time production—may it come soon and stay!—America will be ready to produce at full speed.



Rule of Reason

Voluntary arbitration existed among the inhabitants of ancient India, was carried on by the Greeks and was developed to a high degree of effectiveness by the Romans. It was warmly commended by the Fathers of the Church, and a biographer of St. Augustine tells us that the Bishop of Hippo spent whole days at a time hearing and deciding cases in which he had been chosen as arbitrator not only by Christians but by unbelievers as well.

Voluntary arbitration has had, from the beginning, two objectives: 1. To prevent open strife—war between nations, violence between social and economic groups; 2. To avoid tedious expensive and wasteful litigation. These two objectives are, obviously, of the utmost importance in modern relations between labor and management. They are more urgent than ever during this war effort. Direct negotiation of contracts by collective bargaining between labor and management is, thank God, accepted procedure in our country today. But no contract, just as no law, can be written which may not need interpretation. Human language is inadequate, and all possible contingencies cannot be foreseen. Therefore it is wise and necessary to arrange betimes for the peaceful, orderly and expeditious settlement of disputes arising out of the contract.—*From an address by the Very Rev. Thomas J. Tobin at the Oregon State Industrial Union Council Convention, January 8, 1944.*

Religious and Racial Prejudice

GEORGE E. SOKOLSKY

*Reprinted from the NEW YORK SUN**

ARCHBISHOP SPELLMAN, in a letter to his father published in *Collier's*, wrote:

Little pestilences, fires and avalanches, religious and racial hatreds kill, burn and sweep onward. "Hodie mihi; cras tibi," Christians and Jews may say to one another. "Today, me; tomorrow, you," is true of more things than death. Self-interest, as well as mutual sympathy, should unite Jews, Christians, all nationalities, all peoples in common efforts for justice and peace.

In the misery of the last quarter century hate, rising out of the last war and the poverty and torture of the spirit induced by it, stalked the earth. Hate became an instrument of power. Politicians became specialists in hate and gathered about them experts in designs for hate. Like the "Black Death," this disease flowed into every land, including ours, destroying not only the body but the spirit of man. It has left the mark of Cain upon a generation.

Jews were very great sufferers, but not the only sufferers. Catholics, Protestants, Socialists, Communists, capitalists, landowners, kulaks, Fascists—every kind and type of person in different places and at different times became the object of attack, smear, curse, torture and even death. When this war is over the statisticians will find that more people were killed by hatred than by war, more civilians

than soldiers, as many women and children as men in uniform. And hatred cripples even more than it kills; it cripples the spirit and leaves the body mean. The horror of it is that hate continues, that organs of hate thrive, that antagonisms are being fomented and that a vested interest is being established in the prolongation of this disease.

Two kinds of racketeers thrive on the misfortunes of the Jews: there are those who earn a living out of stimulating an antagonism to the Jews and those who earn a living out of fighting for the Jews. These enterprisers in hatred keep the fight alive because it is their livelihood. They never permit the antagonisms to die down. They smear and attack and boycott. Each side employs provocateurs, agents and spies. Each side deluges the world with mimeographed sheets, pamphlets and books. Each side preaches hate. Each side attacks reconciliation and friendship, and opposes those who, like Archbishop Spellman, realize that it is "Today, me; tomorrow, you."

If I were to list the principal stimulants for hate in this country, I would not only include those Christians who earn their livings attacking Jews, but also those Christians who earn their livings attacking the opponents of the Jews. In the history of

* 280 Broadway, New York, N. Y., October 19, 1943.

my people we have often suffered as grievously from our friends as from our enemies. The so-called friends, lacking philosophic breadth and being concerned principally with the financial increment of friendship, create and stimulate enmities which in the end bring upon us catastrophes. I am minded of the story of Don Pedro of Spain in the fourteenth century, whose excessive and not-disinterested friendship brought upon the Jews of that country the horrible disasters of the fifteenth century. Friendship should be based upon morals and love, not upon salaries and the fomenting of hate.

Archbishop Spellman is a safer guide for both Christian and Jew than the various societies and associations and committees that exist to

stimulate antagonism and hatred. He says: "Self-interest, as well as mutual sympathy, should unite Jews, Christians . . ." The self-interest of those who believe in God and God's inspiration is to avoid hate, to fear the poison of hate, to fear and resent the poisoner, the one who encourages, stimulates, stirs the ingredients of hate. Even when they speak well of us, they are evil. Even when they battle for us, they do evil. For their objective is evil. It is to live by making human beings hate each other. It is to grow rich out of the muck of human misery. Those who speak glibly of post-war planning might include in their grand schemes a proposal for the restoration to the human race of the balance of love and forgiveness. That is civilization.



Citizens and the State

The worth of a state, in the long run, is the worth of the individuals composing it; and a state which postpones the interests of *their* mental expansion and elevation, to a little more of administrative skill, or that semblance of it which practice gives, in the details of business; a state which dwarfs its men, in order that they may be more docile instruments in its hands even for beneficial purposes, will find that with small men no great thing can really be accomplished; and that the perfection of machinery to which it has sacrificed everything, will in the end avail it nothing, for want of the vital power which, in order that the machine might work more smoothly, it has preferred to banish.

—*John Stuart Mill.*

Poland and the New Appeasement

Reprinted from The TRIBUNE*

THE advance of the Red Army across the Polish frontier has been followed by a revival of the still undecided Polish-Russian controversy. The Polish Government in exile has issued a statement expressing the hope that "the hour of liberation is drawing near," and claiming full justice and redress, including the re-establishment of Polish Sovereign administration over the territories of the Republic; while the Premier has expressed readiness to co-operate with the Russians, "providing complications arising from demands on certain Polish territories can be removed." Meanwhile, the direction is that the Red Army is not to be opposed by the Polish underground movement.

This seems all that can reasonably be expected until the Poles know whether they are to have their freedom, or whether a large part of the nation is simply to exchange Nazi for Soviet servitude; but a section of the British press, as well as our own, showed a perverted eagerness to find fault with the Poles for taking a stand on their lawful rights, and a strange ingenuity in devising means to justify the power-policies of the Soviet Union.

One of the leader-writers of our morning press has even gone so far as to invoke the principles of the Atlantic Charter in support of the Rus-

sian claim against Poland. "The Soviet Union," we are told, "has never acquiesced in the arbitrary settlement whereby territory which had been Russian for generations was incorporated in the Polish Republic." This sentence contains three historical lessons.

First, the Riga settlement was not an arbitrary "dictate": but, in the words of its preamble, "*a final, lasting and honorable peace based on mutual understanding*," by which the Poles, renouncing their full territorial claims, remained content with a border region, where their culture was still predominant after a century of Russian rule. It was recognized by the Allied and Associated Powers (including Great Britain) in 1923, as having determined the Polish-Russian boundary "by direct agreement."

Secondly, the territory recovered by Poland had been Russian land "for generations" only in the sense of being under Russian dominion—as, for that matter, had Warsaw and the heart of Poland; it was Polish land until the third partition which dissolved the ancient Republic.

Thirdly, the Soviet has repeatedly confirmed the boundary fixed in 1921, at a time when there was no question whatever of armed coercion. It was accepted by Russia at the first Polish-Russian non-aggression pact in 1932, and again at the renewal of that

* 312 Lonadale Street, Melbourne C.I., Australia, January 13, 1944.

pact in 1934, extending it until 1945. (This agreement was violated by the Soviet Union in 1939 without a vestige of provocation, but under the "rule of law" it should be still in force.)

If all this does not constitute "acquiescence," it is difficult to see how any treaty can be secure: certainly none is more "morally valid" under international law than that of Riga. Indeed, this has never been questioned by Great Britain, whose Government favors a revision by friendly negotiation between the two nations, with the help of their allies, in which Poland would receive full compensation for any concessions made by her. There may be something to be said for such a revision, though it is impossible to fix a really satisfactory ethnic boundary for East Poland; but the public attitude of Russia towards the whole affair has been simply an intolerable denial of Poland's clear rights, and a reassertion of claims to territory seized by her under the terms of an evil bargain with Hitler—a bargain which the Soviet Government formally invalidated in 1941! Added to this, the Soviet press has loaded the Polish Government in exile with false accusations and contumely, and a so-called "Patriot" movement has been maintained as a puppet organization in Moscow—apparently in order to withdraw the nation's loyalty from the authority recognized by the Allies.

If the public attitude of the So-

viet press means anything, the Moscow and Teheran conferences have achieved nothing in changing the Russian viewpoint on the East European question. The absurd claim is still made that all the free Baltic States incorporated by violence in 1940 are "rightful territories" of the Soviet Union, and that their future is an "internal question" with which no one else must interfere. Mr. Wendell Willkie—probably the firmest friend of the Soviet among important American leaders—was accused of "double-dealing" in *Pravda*, and told to mind his own business, because, in an article designed to promote mutual goodwill, he spoke of persuading Russia to accept international guarantees, rather than seek protection "by political and military control of adjoining territories." Yet, in face of all this, we are still told that it is Poland's leaders who are unreasonable, because they will not "sell out" their brethren in East Poland, or ask them to incur the ghastly risk of open revolt in favor of an "ally" whose conduct has been so strangely hostile!

A NEW "MUNICH"

This week there has been published a reported Russian proposal for a settlement, by which the new frontier is to be established as in 1939, except that Bialystok and Grodno are to be given back to the Poles. It seems to be assured on all sides that the Baltic States, Lithuania, Latvia and Esthonia, will simply become Rus-

sian provinces, though there is no shadow of justification for suppressing their independence. Poland is to have German territory given to her by way of compensation — presumably East Prussia and at least part of Silesia. Everything points to this as being the probable line of future arrangement, but if this is so, it is well that we should realize the real character of the decision. *It will be a new "Munich"—a surrender to force by which Russia's appetite will be "appeased," the East European peoples playing the part of victim played by Czechoslovakia in 1938.* All the fine talk in the world will not veil this truth from those who see things as they are, and not as they would have them—and the nations of Europe and the East will draw their own conclusions as to the value of Atlantic Charter pledges, and the pros-

pect of security for the weak under the "rule of law."

The end towards which such policies point is not pleasant to contemplate: for we have no more assurance in this case than in that of Hitler Germany as to final boundaries or final demands, while ideological propagandists in our midst can always be trusted to find a new pretext when the time comes, and to hamper resistance by confusing the issues. We are at the parting of the way between a settlement based on the "rule of law" and one which is merely an expression of the power of those who impose it—giving the prospect of a new era of rival combinations, ending in a fresh struggle for supremacy. "*The test is Poland,*" and the omens do not appear particularly comforting at the present hour.



Family Allowances

Following the principles given to us by the great Pontiffs Leo XIII and Pius XI, we believe that a system of family allowances ought to be introduced in this country. We know that some such system already exists with the dependents of our men and women with the fighting forces, and several industries have already schemes in operation.

We welcome that particular scheme of family allowances outlined in the recent Government report on social security, provided always that the freedom of the individual and of the family is secured.—*Most Rev. Bernard W. Griffin, Archbishop of Westminster, January 18, 1944.*

SOME THINGS OLD AND NEW

EASTER DATE

What is the actual historical date of Our Lord's Resurrection? I have read about the Easter Controversy, what is that? And what is the modern idea about a fixed Easter?

Easter, which is the commemoration of Our Lord's Resurrection from the dead, is always observed on a Sunday, because it was on a Sunday that Jesus Christ rose from the tomb. That is the Christian tradition, to which Catholics, Oriental Dissidents, Anglicans, and most other Protestants hold.

As to the date of Easter, it is reckoned to be the first Sunday after the full moon which occurs on or next after March 21. So that under the prevailing estimation Easter always falls on a Sunday between March 22 and April 25.

Furthermore, the Holy See has never made any sort of declaration which might assign any day of the month to the Crucifixion, which, of course, would place the Resurrection two days later—that is, on the Sunday following Good Friday. The sentence in the Creed that Our Lord rose from the dead on the "third day" is according to the ancient Roman reckoning, which included the first day, so that Sunday would be reckoned the third day from Friday.

But Biblical scholars, after a great deal of scientific research, have placed the actual date of the Resurrection on April 9 in the year A.D. 30—that is, Our Lord was crucified on Friday April 7, and the Resurrection took place two days later.

The so-called Easter Controversy regarded the day on which Easter should be celebrated. It was settled at the First Council of Nicaea in A.D. 325. There was another Easter controversy which arose between the native British Christians and Saint Augustine of Canterbury, as to the date for the observance of Easter. This dispute went on from the beginning of the 7th century until it was settled according to the Roman observance at the Synod of Whitby in 664.

A fixed Easter has two aspects. The first, proposed mostly by business men, is that Easter should be on a fixed date. The second, to which there now seems no apparent theological or canonical objection, is that Easter should be observed on a certain fixed Sunday. The Holy See has apparently offered no objection to this, save that it would call for the concurrence of the Anglicans and Oriental Dissidents. A distinguished English Catholic Bishop declared that it would require nothing more than a stroke of the pen to decide upon a

fixed Easter Sunday. By that he meant, as he explained, that all that would be needed would be for the Pope to decree that the number of Sundays after Epiphany be fixed. And if that were done, then Easter Sunday would automatically be a fixed Sunday after Epiphany. That would ensure that Easter always fell upon a Sunday, according to ancient Christian tradition, and not upon a week day.

FASCIST POPE

I am very much disturbed by an account I read in the press some time ago, that the Papacy is Fascist in character and is linked to Fascism.

Do not allow a stupid thing like that to disturb you. The story about Papal Fascism came from Russian sources, and the Russian sources got the alleged information from an anti-Catholic magazine, published by a group of apostates in the United States.

It is perfectly true that the Holy See did sign a treaty and concordat with the Italian Fascist Government. This is the famous Lateran Pact of 1929, whereby the State of Vatican City was juridically established and the old Roman Question, as it was called, was settled.

That Treaty was entered into between the Holy See and the Royal Italian Government, and as that Government happened to be a Fascist government, then the Holy See established political and diplomatic relations with a Fascist government. But

that did not make either the Pope or the Holy See Fascist.

Shortly after the Lateran Treaty was ratified by both parties, that is, by the Holy See and the King of Italy, Benito Mussolini, the Fascist Premier, started a course of action that was not only detrimental to the welfare of the Catholic Church in Italy, but was also in contravention to certain clauses of the treaty which the Mussolini Government had ratified.

When Italy went into the war against Abyssinia, Mussolini forbade the Italian newspapers to report the public statements which Pius XI made on that war crisis. When the Fascist Government went in strongly for absurd racial ideas, either borrowed from or thrust upon them by Chancellor Hitler, Pope Pius XI roundly condemned these same ideas. And when Hitler visited Rome on a more or less state visit, and the streets of the Eternal City were decorated with the swastika, Pius XI, who had diplomatically gone to his country villa at Castel Gandolfo, had some stinging words to say about the crooked cross that was not the Cross of Christ.

The Pope's relations with Spain are also cited as another instance of Papal Fascism, so-called. But if the Pope wished the Franco regime well after it had restored the Catholic Church to its ancient and proper place in Spain, it is also the fact that relations became strained between the Holy See and the Franco government, when the Vatican decided, very prop-

erly, that the Spanish State was attempting to arrogate to itself certain powers to which it had no juridical claim whatsoever.

There is no evidence that the Pope or the Holy See is Fascist. Fascism, as a system of state totalitarianism, is entirely at variance with the teachings of the Catholic Church, and it is absurd to accuse the Pope of supporting that which his pontifical office obliges him to disavow. Read the Encyclicals of Pius XI and Pius XII, especially *Mit Brenender Sorge* and *Non Abbiamo Bisogno*, and see what they said.

CZARTORYSKI—POLISH PRINCE AND PRIEST

Who was the Polish prince whose name, so I have heard, was proposed for the honors of the altar?

You probably have in mind the young Polish prince, better known as Father August Czartoryski, who died a member of the Salesian Order.

Prince Ladislas of Poland was the father of Father August, and his mother was a member of the royal family of Spain, Princess Amparo, grand-daughter of the Spanish Queen Maria Christina.

Whether these Polish princely parents were exiled is not clear, but the young prince was born in Paris in 1858. As a babe he suffered from a serious complaint, which left him delicate for the rest of his life.

His youth and early manhood were spent in the royal court of Spain, where the formalities as well as the

numerous functions of state bored him, and he turned to the exercises of religion as a respite from the frivolities and enticements of court life.

Then, on an auspicious day in 1883 he was privileged to serve the Mass of Saint John Bosco, founder of the Salesian Order, and from that time on he was filled with a desire to join the new order.

But, so it seems, neither the saintly founder of the Salesians nor his own father gave the young royal prince any encouragement to escape from court life to enter the life of religion.

The young prince was not discouraged, however, and for four years he kept after Don Bosco, begging to be admitted into the Salesians. So at last the Saint told the prince to go to the Pope, and see what the Holy Father (Leo XIII) had to say about it.

His Holiness was surprised at this unexpected request, knowing a great deal about the ways of royal princes. But eventually the Holy Father gave the young Czartoryski his blessing and told him that he might apply for entry into the society of the Salesians. So it followed that on November 24, 1887, the prince received the habit of the Salesians at the hands of Saint John Bosco himself.

On April 2, 1892 he was ordained to the priesthood, but on April 8, 1893 he died.

In 1942 the Sacred Congregation of Rites approved the introduction of